

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

W. KURRELMAYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
MACKENZIE, W. ROY.—"Standing Water,"	283
NICOLSON, MARJORIE H.—Milton's "Old Damocles,"	293
SMALL, GEORGE W.—The Syntax of 'the' with the Comparative,	300
CAWLEY, ROBERT R.—A Chaucerian Echo in Spenser,	313
PENNINGTON, WALTER.—The "Lucy" Poems,	314
PARKER, ROSCOE E.—A Note on 'Corones Two,'	317
COOPER, C. E.—Tintinnabulation,	318
BENDER, CLIFFORD A.—Another Forgotten Novel,	319
RICHARDS, ALFRED E.—Milton's Popularity in the Eighteenth Century,	322
GREENLAW, EDWIN.—Two Notes on Spenser's Classical Sources,	323
ROLLINS, HYDER E.—'A Handful of Pleasant Delights,'	327
NOYES, E. S.—A Note on 'Peregrine Pickle' and 'Pygmalion,'	327
EDDY, WILLIAM A.—'The Anatomist Dissected'—by Lemuel Gulliver,	330

## REVIEWS:—

J. W. KRUTH, Comedy and Conscience after the Reformation. [John W. Draper.]	332
ERNEST WEEKLEY, A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. [John C. French.]	334
GEORGES GIRAUD, La Jeunesse d'Anatole France;	
MICHEL CORDAT, Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France. [J. K. Ditchy.]	334
CHARLES TAILLIANT, L'Algérie dans la Littérature Française; Essai de Bibliographie Méthodique et Raisonnée. [Gilbert Chinard.]	336
EDMOND HUGUET, Dictionnaire de la Langue Française du Seizième Siècle. [H. C. Lancaster.]	339
T. F. CRANE, Liber de Miraculis Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie. [Grace Frank.]	340
BERNARD MANDEVILLE, The Fable of the Bees. Edited by F. B. Kaye. [Edwin Greenlaw.]	341
FR. AURELIUS POMPEI, The English Versions of The Ship of Fools. [Frederick M. Padelford.]	344
JULIUS VODOZ, La Fée aux Miettes. [L. Piaget Shanks.]	346
Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 3-5. [W. Kurrelmayer.]	347
H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER, Chryseide et Arimant, Tragicomédie de Jean Mairet (1625). [Colbert Searles.]	348
EDGAR MILTON BOWMAN, The Early Novels of Paul Bourget. [James D. Sörber.]	349
PIERRE CHAMPION, Ronsard et son Temps. [H. C. Lancaster.]	351
F. VÉNET, Autour de Voltaire, avec quelques inédits. [Gilbert Chinard.]	352

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1904

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

## EDITED BY

Edwin Greenlaw, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,  
and H. Carrington Lancaster

## ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, Gilbert Chinard, Hermann Collitz, John C. French,  
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, J. Robles, R. B. Reulston

---

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is  
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other  
countries included in the Postal Union.

---

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the  
Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins  
Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

---

---

## NEW OXFORD BOOKS

---

### ATALA AND RENÉ, by François-René de Chateaubriand

Edited with an Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by CAROLINE STEWART.  
With 4 Portraits and a Map. \$1.00

The two stories in this book comprise the latest addition to the Oxford French  
Series by American Scholars. "Atala" embodies the poetic impression of what  
Chateaubriand saw in America in the latter part of the eighteenth century.  
"René" is his autobiography, a portrait of himself and the life of his day.

### DIFFÉRENTS SOUVENIRS DE JEUNESSE, being episodes selected from the novels of Anatole France. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by F. V. BOYSON. 50c.

This volume, in a New Series of Contemporary French Authors, contains eight  
stories from popular novels by Anatole France.

A new complete Catalogue of Oxford French Books will be sent on application.



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume XLI

May, 1926

Number 5

---

## "STANDING WATER"

In the fifth scene of the first act of *Twelfth Night* the shipwrecked Viola, posing as a youth named Cesario, has come in her "masculine usurp'd attire" to woo the Lady Olivia for her master, the Duke Orsino. Her entrance to the lady's house is barred by the watchful steward Malvolio, who is nevertheless compelled by her insistence to announce her presence to Olivia. Thereupon this dialogue ensues between the mistress and her steward:

*Olivia.* Tell him he shall not speak with me.

*Malvolio.* He has been told so; and he says he'll stand at your door like a sheriff's post, and be the supporter to a bench, but he'll speak to you.

*Olivia.* What kind o' man is he?

*Malvolio.* Why, of mankind.

*Olivia.* What manner of man?

*Malvolio.* Of very ill manner; he'll speak with you, will you or no.

*Olivia.* Of what personage and years is he?

*Malvolio.* Not yet old enough for a man, nor young enough for a boy, as a squash is before 'tis a peascod, or a coddling when 'tis almost an apple; 'tis with him in standing water, between boy and man. He is very well-favoured and he speaks very shrewishly; one would think his mother's milk were scarce out of him.

The crux of this passage—though it must be admitted that most editors of the play have hardly felt it to be one—is the statement, "tis with him in standing water, between boy and man." For the moment I shall merely call attention to the fact that all of Malvolio's references to the supposed youth Cesario are highly contemptuous, and, leaving this cryptic remark for later reference, I shall now record the notes which have been written to explain the clause, "'tis with him in standing water."

The Variorum edition of the play reproduces the notes of two commentators, Capell and Wright. Both of these notes concern themselves with the bearing of the word "in," and ignore the consequent phrase "standing water." Capell regards the word as an error, and substitutes "e'en." Wright inclines to accept the original reading as correct, and ventures this explanation: "The phrase, if the reading be correct, must mean 'in the condition of standing water.'" The Variorum editor (Howard Horace Furness) emphatically and properly endorses this note, and with that we may leave our consideration of the word "in." There is no doubt whatsoever that, so far as the preposition is concerned, the phrase signifies "in the condition of standing water." Furness proceeds, however, with this suggestion for the interpretation of the whole phrase: "*Possibly*, the simile was drawn from the tides at London Bridge. In the *Tempest*, II, 1, 236, Sebastian says, 'I am standing water,' where, as the context shows, he means just at the turn of the tide, neither ebbing nor rising." This explanation of "standing water," as we shall see, is the recurrent one in the notes for both *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest*, the two plays in which the phrase appears.

Rolfe, in his edition of *Twelfth Night*, reproduces Schmidt's note: "*In standing water*. That is, between the ebb and the flood of the tide." He agrees with this interpretation, and quotes the parallel instance from *The Tempest*, II, 1, 221; "Well, I am standing water."

Professor Walter M. Hart, in his notes for the Tudor edition of the play, gives the same explanation with equal confidence: "*Standing water*. Water at the turn of the tide, neither ebbing nor flowing."<sup>1</sup>

In the notes on this passage, then, we find a virtual unanimity, and the diffidence of the earlier editions gives way to a complete confidence in the later ones. A good while ago I began to feel dissatisfied with these explanations. There did not seem to me to be any special disparagement in the comparison of a young man to a river standing poised between its tidal ebb and its tidal flow,

<sup>1</sup> N. E. D., however under the word *standing*, II, 7, gives the definition: "Of water, a piece of water: Still, not ebbing or flowing, stagnant," and quotes the passage from *Twelfth Night*.



and, furthermore, it seemed quite certain to me that Malvolio was searching his precise brain for every unsavory simile that he could fit to the case. While I was considering these things, my memory, the warder of my own poor brain, brought in the recollection of an afternoon, years past, when I was discussing certain grave matters with an ancient and illiterate countryman of mine. We were being interrupted and annoyed from time to time by the housewife, who was less interested in our high discourse than she was in the occasional wagon that passed down the road and the sporadic sails that appeared from time to time out on the bay. The natural chagrin which my old friend was enduring constrained him to make the following apology, delivered to me in cautious undertones: "Melissy," he said, "is what ye would call a little queer. She isn't crazy, but no more could ye say that she's wise. She's like a swamp that's neither land nor water, and she doesn't know enough to hold her tongue when gentlemen are discoursin.'"

In this true tale, I believe, is contained the same contemptuous simile which Malvolio applied, with a different interpretation, to the impudent young intruder who insisted on delivering his message "will you or no." I must on no account base my conclusion on an anecdote which the sceptic might suppose me capable of trumping up *ad hoc*, and I shall have more substantial proofs to offer presently. My next step shall be to scrutinize the parallel passage in *The Tempest*.

In the first scene of the second act of this play the King of Naples and his companions are wandering aimlessly about the island after the supposed wreck of their ship. Wearied with their exertions, the King and most of his company lie down on the ground and go to sleep. The only ones who remain awake are Sebastian, the shifty brother of the King, and Antonio, the usurping Duke of Milan. The latter has attained his dukedom through treachery, and he is now anxious to make a pupil of Sebastian, who, as he thinks, may easily attain an even higher position by the same method. The following conversation passes between the two friends.

Antonio.

Noble Sebastian,

Thou let'st thy fortune sleep—die, rather; wink'st  
Whiles thou art waking.

- Sebastian.*                   Thou dost snore distinctly;  
                                   There's meaning in thy snores.
- Antonio.*                I am more serious than my custom; you  
                                   Must be so too, if heed me, which to do,  
                                   Trebles thee o'er.
- Sebastian.*               Well, *I am standing water.*
- Antonio.*                I'll teach you how to flow.
- Sebastian.*               Do so; to ebb  
                                   Hereditary sloth instructs me.

The Variorum edition of the play quotes only one comment—that of Jephson—on Sebastian's rejoinder, "Well, I am standing water." The comment is this: "The meaning seems to be, 'I am stagnant, slow of understanding and action; for Antonio follows up the metaphor by saying he will teach Sebastian how to flow, and Sebastian rejoins that his natural or hereditary slothfulness teaches him rather to ebb.'" It is impossible to decide from the vague wording of this note what definition is intended for the phrase "standing water," but one may surmise that the burden of defining is simply avoided. Furness himself makes no comment here, but it will be recalled that he pronounced thus on this passage while considering the same phrase in *Twelfth Night*: "Sebastian says, 'I am standing water,' where, as the context shows, he means just at the turn of the tide, neither ebbing nor rising."

Rolfe's note, like Jephson's, may be based on what I should consider a right understanding of the phrase, but it, also, carefully avoids a specific explanation. It runs thus: "*I am standing water* = I am passive, ready to listen to you and to be influenced by you."

Professor Herbert E. Greene, in his notes for the Tudor edition of the play, is explicit enough. His comment on the passage is: "*I am standing water.* I am quiet, between ebb and flow, ready to listen."

Let us now proceed independently with this passage from *The Tempest*. When Sebastian says, "Well, I am standing water," he quite obviously means, "Well, I am in a state of passivity. I am not doing or saying anything. Go ahead and say what you obviously wish to say." Now, both Antonio and Sebastian are inveterate punsters, quibblers, and corruptors of words. In every conversation in which they bear a part they regard a sentence as

but a cheveril glove to a good wit. Therefore, when Sebastian defines himself *figuratively* as "standing water," Antonio immediately pounces upon the *literal* meaning<sup>2</sup> of his phrase, pretending, according to the well-known rules of the wit combat, not to have realized that it was meant figuratively. "I'll teach you how to flow," he says, which, in effect, means, "You are stagnant water, are you? Well, I'll teach you to be running water." But he has used the word "flow," which has a double meaning, and Sebastian immediately counters on him by seizing on the second or unintended meaning—*flow* as against *ebb* in the cycle of the tide. "Do so," he says, "To ebb hereditary sloth instructs me."

That is, "standing water" does not suggest flow *and* ebb, as Furness contends, but "standing water" suggests "flow" to Antonio, and "flow" *independently* suggests "ebb" to Sebastian. And, it may be remarked as an aside, this is the only interpretation that can give life or meaning to the situation. The whole passage, as I have quoted it, is a wit combat or it is nothing, and if "standing water" suggested *both* flow and ebb, then Sebastian, instead of countering nimbly on his friend according to his custom, merely phrases a stupid rejoinder which, since it was implicit in his first speech, was obvious from the start.

The plays of Shakspeare afford countless instances of the wit combat, and the rules of the game can easily be deduced from these examples. It is a contest in which each participant eagerly watches for some weak point in the last remark or rejoinder of his opponent—some phrase which can be interpreted in a way not intended or foreseen by the opponent, and which is quickly twisted into this new meaning and flung back in his face. I have selected, almost at random, a passage of words between Romeo and Benvolio which will serve as well as any other to illustrate the verbal duello. It is a trifle more extended than the bout between Sebastian and Antonio, but every pass in it is made in accordance with the same familiar code.

*Benvolio.* Tell me in sadness, who is that you love?

*Romeo.* What, shall I groan and tell thee?

---

<sup>2</sup> It is not strictly necessary to insist upon the application of both figurative and literal in this wit combat. The purpose of my explanation will

- Benvolio.* Groan! Why, no;  
But sadly tell me who.
- Romeo.* Bid a sick man in sadness make his will. . . .  
Ah, word ill urg'd to one who is so ill!  
In sadness, cousin, I do love a woman.
- Benvolio.* I aim'd so near when I suppos'd you lov'd.
- Romeo.* A right good mark-man! And she's fair I love.
- Benvolio.* A right fair mark, fair coz, is soonest hit.
- Romeo.* Well, in that hit you miss. She'll not be hit  
With Cupid's arrow; she hath Dian's wit;  
And, in strong proof of chastity well arm'd,  
'Gainst Love's weak childish bow she lives unharm'd.\*

At every turn of this dialogue there is some particular word that serves as the instrument of attack—a word which may be used in different senses, and which, as soon as it is used by one speaker in one sense, is pounced upon by the other speaker in another sense and hurled back at his antagonist. The first of these is “sadness,” used by Benvolio with the meaning “soberness.” It is seized at once by Romeo, is given another of its meanings—“grief”—and, thus transformed, is returned to Benvolio. A little later Benvolio gives a skilful twist to the word “fair,” which Romeo has unsuspectingly used, attaches it to the word “mark,” which has also appeared in his opponent's last speech, and scores a very palpable hit. And so on, until Romeo has the last word.

To every skilled practitioner of the wit combat, then, it was obvious that his skilled rival could be scored against only by a quick, subtle twist in some variable word which the rival himself had used in his last remark. No student of *The Tempest* need be told that Sebastian and Antonio are verbal duellists of the first house, and no student of the science of verbal fencing need be persuaded that they are crossing foils in the passage under dispute.

## II

The passages which I have cited from *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest* are the only ones in which Shakspeare employs the definite phrase “standing water,” and this absence of parallel instances in Shakspeare's own writing is probably the cause of what I consider a

be served equally well by supposing that Antonio is here applying an unexpected figurative extension to Sebastian's remark.

\* *Romeo and Juliet*, Act I, Scene 1, ll. 205-217.



current misapprehension, since in neither of these passages is the meaning obviously unambiguous. It is doubtless well known that Shakspeare, and his contemporaries also, frequently couple such words as "pool," "pond," and "lake" with the epithet "standing," and I shall attempt to show presently that these phrases are all synonymous with the phrase "standing water," but I propose first to consider some passages from contemporary Elizabethan writing which contain the actual phrase "standing water."

The King James version of Psalm 107, verse 35, is: "He turneth the wilderness into a *standing water* and dry ground into watersprings." Here the phrase is undoubtedly a dignified one, and is equivalent to "a lake," or, as an Elizabethan would say if he preferred to do so, "a standing lake."

In Book II, Chapter 6 (1587 edition), of the *Description of England*, Harrison discourses upon "the food and diet of the English," and, since beer and ale played a constant part in the process of nourishing the Elizabethan body, he devotes some space to a consideration of the best methods for brewing these nutritive drinks. "In this trade," he says, "our brewers observe very diligently the nature of the water, which they daily occupy, and soil through which it passeth, for all waters are not of like goodness, sith *the fattest standing water* is always the best; for, although the waters that run by chalk or cledgy soils be good, and next unto the Thames water, which is the most excellent, yet the water that standeth in either of these is the best for us that dwell in the country, as whereon the sun lieth longest, and fattest fish is bred." Here the distinction is clearly made between "standing water" and water that runs—continuously or through the alternate processes of ebb and flow, as the case may be. Here, also, the phrase is a comparatively dignified one, for the simple reason that Harrison adopts a respectful tone in using it because he considers it a valuable fluid for the purpose in hand. Uttered with a change of tone the phrase "fat (i. e., thick, or even slimy) standing water" may quickly degenerate into a disgusting expression, as we shall presently see.

In *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Part I, Sec. 2, Mem. 2, Sub. 1.) Burton considers, under the successive headings "Beer" and "Waters," the same domestic topic that is handled by Harrison in

the chapter from which I have just quoted, and he considers it with a difference. "*Standing waters*, says Burton, "thick and ill-coloured, such as come forth of pools, and moats, where hemp hath been steeped, or slimy fishes live, are most unwholesome, putrified, and full of mites, creepers, slimy, muddy, unclean, corrupt, impure, by reason of the sun's heat, and *still-standing*; they cause foul distemperatures in the body and mind of man, are unfit to make drink of, to dress meat with, or to be used about men inwardly or outwardly. They are good for many domestic uses, to wash horses, cattle, &c, or in time of necessity, but not otherwise. Some are of opinion that such *fat standing waters* make the best beer, and that seething doth defecate it, as Cardan holds, *Lib. 13 subtil.* 'It mends the substance and savour of it,' but it is a paradox."

### III.

These quotations from contemporary Elizabethan writings will, I believe, make it quite clear that the phrase "standing water" was a familiar and established one as applied to water that does not run or that is not subjected to the processes of ebb and flow. It is equally important, however, to understand that this phrase could be varied, according to the whim of the speaker or writer, by such phrases as "standing pool" and "standing lake," and the link may be supplied by another quotation from the same subsection in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* from which I borrowed my last quotation. Under the heading "Fishes" Burton comments thus: "Rhasis and Magninus discommend all fish, and say they breed *viscosities*, slimy nutriment, little and humorous nourishment. Savanarola adds, cold, moist: and phlegmatic, Isaac; and therefore unwholesome for all cold and melancholy complexions: others make a difference, rejecting only among fresh-water fish, eel, tench, lamprey, crawfish (which Bright approves, *Cap. 6*), and such as are bred in *muddy and standing waters*, and have a taste of mud, as Franciscus Bonsuetus poetically defines, *Lib. de aquatilibus*.

Nam pisces omnes, qui stagna, lacusque frequentant,  
Semper plus succi deterioris habent."

This Latin quotation is thus rendered into English in a parallel column, by Burton:

All fish that *standing pools and lakes* frequent  
Do ever yield bad juice and nourishment.

It is obviously unnecessary to add any comment to the evidence of this definitive quotation. The gloss on "*stagna, lacusque*" of the Latin passage, and on "*standing pools and lakes*" of the English translation, is, in contempt of question, "*muddy and standing waters.*"

The case, I suppose, may now be regarded as proved, but for the sake of finality of treatment I should like to subjoin three instances—out of many available ones—that will show the easy variability of the substantive that could be conjoined with the constant attribute "*standing*" in Elizabethan conversation.

When Prospero abjures his potent art in the first scene of the final act of *The Tempest* he begins by apostrophizing the different groups of spirits that have aided him in his mastery over the elements.

Ye elves of hills, brooks, *standing lakes*, and groves,  
And ye that on the sands with printless foot  
Do chase the ebbing Neptune, and do fly him  
When he comes back—

These are the first two groups in his list, and in delimiting the spheres of their activities he places the "*standing lakes*" in a category distinct from that containing the water which ebbs and flows. The word "*standing*" definitely marks that distinction in this passage, but it does not include the idea of stagnancy in any unpleasant sense. In the two passages that follow, however, the presence of that idea is obvious.

The "Sir Oracle" speech in the first scene of *The Merchant of Venice* is so well known that it may be presumed that the recollection of every reader of Shakspeare who is condescending to my pedantry will already have supplied it. "There are," says the sprightly Gratiano,

a sort of men whose visages  
Do cream and mantle like a *standing pond*  
And do a wilful stillness entertain,  
With purpose to be dress'd in an opinion  
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit.

The second line of my citation refers, of course, to the gathering of scum on the surface of stagnant water, and the remaining lines

fix the comparison of this unwholesome phenomenon with the assumption of a cloak of dignity and reticence on the face of the would-be wise man. The important word in this second line, I believe, is "standing," in the sense of "stagnant." The substantive "pond" I believe, by the same token, to be accidental, and synonymous with "water" or "pool" or any other term that could lend itself to the idea of fixity in the most common of liquids.

In *The Duchess of Malfi*, Act I, Scene 1, the villain Bosola expresses this cynical opinion of the Duke Ferdinand and the Cardinal his brother:

He and his brother are like plum-trees that grow crooked over *standing pools*; they are rich and o'erladen with fruit, but none but crows, pies, and caterpillars feed on them.

Here, one need hardly contend, we have a disgusting picture of the battenning process beside a swamp or a shallow pool of filthy water, and here also, as in the preceding quotation, it is obvious that the speaker is pointing his sarcasm with the same comparison—used with a difference—that Malvolio borrows for the nonce to discredit young Cesario.

#### IV.

On the negative side, then, the phrases "standing pond," "standing pool," "standing lake," and "standing water" are all synonymous, and they all denote, in common, the absence of progressive motion or of the alternate motions of ebb and flow. On the positive side there are minor distinctions in Elizabethan usage which may be deduced readily enough from the quotations that I have presented. "Standing ponds" and "standing pools" are swamps, marshes, or collections of thick and stagnant water. The "standing lake" is—ordinarily, at least—the larger, deeper and more dignified body of water that stands in its place without flow. "Standing water" is any or all of the others, and, in any given instance, it is what the speaker who refers to it will indicate by the tone of his reference or by his contextual phraseology. In the Biblical passage that I have cited, for instance, the phrase is obviously synonymous with "standing lake."

We may complete the circle by returning to the passages in *The Tempest* and in *Twelfth Night*. In the former passage the phrase "standing water" is clearly used in its general negative sense



denoting passivity or absence of motion, and here, as I have shown, the phrase provokes a verbal attack with flowing water which, in its turn, receives a counter attack with flowing-and-ebbing water. In the latter passage the phrase, uttered as it is in a bitterly sarcastic tone, just as clearly denotes the "standing pond" or "standing pool." I have already explained that my interpretation of Malvolio's contemptuous response to the question, "Of what personage and years is he?" would run, in part, as follows: "If you ask me how old this person is I can only answer that he is neither a boy nor a man, but is in that amorphous state lying between the two. He is like a swamp, which is neither dry land nor running water." This simile, like the ones preceding it in the same speech, has the powerful virtue of making its object seem ridiculous, and I think that even Malvolio would realize that he could hardly expect to raise the laugh against his antagonist by comparing him to a river nobly poised for an instant before returning to its banks.

W. ROY MACKENZIE.

*Washington University.*

### MILTON'S "OLD DAMOETAS"

Which of the fellows or tutors of Christ's College Milton had in mind when he wrote of 'old Damoetas' matters as little, for a real understanding of *Lycidas*, as which of his companions were the 'rough Satyrs' and which the 'Fauns with cloven heel.' Most of the editors of Milton, when they attempt any identification, have settled on Chappell. "Old Damoetas," says Masson, for example,<sup>1</sup> "is either Chappell, whom Milton has long forgiven, or some more kindly fellow of Christ's." Surely, however, all that one learns about Chappell contradicts the idea that he "loved to hear the song" of the students. Milton's early troubles aside, Chappell seems to have been recognized by all who knew him as a man who was respected rather than liked by his students, whereas Milton's line implies some intimacy and affection. Chappell sent out better-trained students than did any other teacher of the college; he was

<sup>1</sup> Masson, David, *Life of Milton*, Cambridge, Macmillan, 1859, I, 611.

the finest disputant in the university; but students and adversaries alike looked back upon their encounters with him with admiration for his intellect, hardly with real feeling for the man himself. Although identification of *Damoetas* with other than Chappell makes little real difference in our understanding of Milton, yet there is some interesting evidence in regard to the matter which may at least throw light upon a man with whom Milton undoubtedly came in contact during his undergraduate years.

Milton was not the only student of Christ's who introduced a kindly tutor into one of his pastoral poems. During the last year of the life at Cambridge of the "lady of Christ's," there matriculated at the college a youth whom his classmates came to call the "angel of Christ's." There were many similarities, other than the nicknames, between Milton and Henry More, afterwards the founder of the Cambridge Platonists, and one of the most influential theologians of his day. Strikingly similar in appearance in their youthful days, both combined interest in poetry with intense interest in theology. In their reactions to Cambridge they had much in common. Later, it is true, More, who had been trained a Calvinist, was to find his place with the latitudinarians, urging toleration in religious belief during those very years while Milton fought with the Puritans and then retired to write *Paradise Lost*, but in their undergraduate days, both showed to a marked degree a fusion of Renaissance and Puritan ideals. Like Milton, More contributed to many of the Cambridge volumes of 'occasional verse'; his Greek elegy on Edward King appears in the same volume which contains *Lycidas*. Like Milton also, More, after completing his university training, turned to the writing of poems, which, in his own day, were certainly more seriously considered by men of intellect than had been the minor poems of Milton, for More was a philosophical poet, who sang "those rythmes which from Platonick rage do powerfully flow forth."

The first of these 'rythmes,' given to an interested—though frankly puzzled—world in 1642, More called *Psychozoia or the Song of the Soul*.<sup>2</sup> Involved and confusing though the allegory is—a combination of Plotinus, Philo Judaeus, Ficino, Pico della

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Poems of Dr. Henry More*, edited by Alexander B. Grosart, Chertsey Worthies Library, 1878.

Mirandola, Chaucer, Spenser, and possibly a dozen other of More's favorites—it offers to the Milton student a curious parallel for Milton's pictures of the Cambridge students who

were nursed upon the self-same hill,  
Fed the same flock by fountain, shade, and rill.

The second and third cantos of More's poem deal with the story of a pilgrimage, told by an old shepherd to younger swains who gather about him for instruction. His pastoral name is not Damoetas, but Mnemon, but he is like Milton's shepherd, one who loves and is loved by a younger generation. The scene in More's poem is evidently laid in some such garden as that of Christ's:

We on grassie bed did lie prostrate,  
Under a shady Beach, which did repell  
The fiery scorching shafts which Uriel  
From Southern quarter darted with strong hand.

The real affection which existed between the teacher and his students is evidenced again and again by their interruption and eager questions and by his replies to them. Such an interlude as this is characteristic: a student to whom More gives the name Subtimidus has hesitated to ask a question of the old shepherd, not knowing how it will be received; but he is reassured when he sees the courtesy and kindness with which Mnemon replies to the ingenuous question of another student.

Subtimidus, when Tharrhon sped so well,  
Took courage to himself and thus 'gan say  
To Mnemon: Pray you Sir vouchsafe to tell  
What Autaparnes and Hypomone  
And Simon do this while in Dizoie.  
With that his face shone like the rosie Morn  
With maiden blush from inward modesty.

Then More comments:

Old Mnemon lov'd the Lad even from his face,  
Which blamelesse blush with sanguin light had dyed.

The story which More's Mnemon tells is of his youthful wandering through the strange countries of Beirah (the brutish life), Psittacusa-land (the country of parrot speech), Dizoia (the country of 'double-livednesse'), until he finally achieved Psychania, the

land of the spirit. Beneath its complex allegory, one may read the story of a man whose youth was a period of doubt, making for scepticism, but who finally achieved what was to him the serenity of belief. Now in his age he is telling the tale to a youthful generation in an attempt to keep them from that fruitless wandering. There is little doubt in the mind of anyone who has read the rest of More's poetry that this scene is founded upon reality. His allegory, usually abstruse and chaotic, becomes for the time being almost clear, and often really interesting; his portraits are of individuals, not, as in the rest of the poem, of philosophical abstractions; most of all his portrait of Mnemon rings true.

Was there, then, any fellow of Christ's who corresponded to Milton's 'old Damoetas' and to More's Mnemon? Certainly it was not Chappell; and it was hardly Robert Gell, More's tutor during a good part of his Cambridge life. But in every way the impression which Milton and More give of this "more kindly fellow of Christ's" does suit that best-loved of all the fellows, Joseph Mead, famous for generations after his death as the author of *Clavis Apocalyptica*, an interpretation of the Book of Revelation which long remained a standard text in theological study.<sup>3</sup> Born at Berden, Essex, in October, 1586, Mead was educated at Christ's College, to which he returned as fellow, and to which he devoted his life, refusing the many tempting offers of preferment which came to him. He was a Renaissance figure in the varied interests which occupied him. He was, says a biographer, "an acute Logician, an accurate Philosopher, a skilful Mathematician, an excellent Anatomist, . . . a great Philologer, a master of many languages, a good proficient in the studies of History and Chronology."<sup>4</sup> Christ's rightly looked upon him as her greatest man and tradition tells that other colleges used to call him in for consultation particularly in connection with studies in anatomy. It was not his

<sup>3</sup> The most interesting account of Mead is that given in *Biographia Evangelica* by the Rev. Erasmus Middleton, London, printed by R. Denham, 1784, III, 73-95; see also the *Dictionary of National Biography*; Masson, *Life of Milton*, I, 101 ff.; Benjamin Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*. London, James Black, 1813, II, 429-434; Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, London, Strahan, 1870, I, 167. There are many letters in Heywood and Wright, *Cambridge University Transactions*, London, Henry Bohn, 1854.

<sup>4</sup> *Biographia Evangelica*, III, 75.



intellectual interests alone, however, which made him Damoetas and Mnemon.

His chamber, on the first floor of Christ's, was the center of the college life. Not a student but knew his windows; indeed, if we may trust tradition, it was not unusual for the students to play pranks upon him, in connection with that window, but they were the pranks of affectionate mischief. To suggestions that he change his quarters, he merely smiled; he liked to be in the midst of things. And in the midst of things he was; no fellow was so popular, none had such communication with the outside world. In spite of the amount of work he did, he kept up an active and lively interest in affairs of the nation and of Europe; he subscribed to a weekly news-letter, the contents of which he used to pour forth enthusiastically at the commons table; he was the correspondent of many of the important men of Europe. To Hartlib (that curious figure who seems to have written to everyone) he wrote of the doings of Cambridge and the country about. He was a true gossip! It was seldom he missed anything, and when he did he was the first to enjoy the laugh on himself. Thus when Emmanuel College in 1622 chose a new Master so secretly that Mead did not know they were to do it until it had been done, he wrote, "Never did I believe till now I see it experienced, that so many as 12 could keep counsell a week together, and fellowes of a colledg too! Who would have thought but there would have bin one Judas among 12!"<sup>5</sup> He was, by all accounts, a charming correspondent, a delightful companion.

But it is in his relations with his students that he is most important. So far as one may judge by contemporary accounts, these relations were not limited to a small group who happened to be entered under him. He was not a mere tutor. Under ordinary circumstances, that part of his time which he devoted to instruction should have gone to lectures, but, unfortunately, he had a slight impediment in his speech, and so declined to lecture except when it was utterly necessary. Instead he felt it his duty to devote that time to more informal talks with students. His biographer says:<sup>6</sup>

He preserved his knowledge in academical learning by the private lec-

---

<sup>5</sup> Heywood and Wright, *Cambridge University Transactions*, II, 312.

<sup>6</sup> *Biographia Evangelica*, III, 77 ff.

tures which he read to his pupils, to whom he was an able and faithful guide. For being a fellow of a college, he esteemed it a part of his duty to further the education of young scholars; which made him undertake the careful charge of a tutor; and this he managed with great prudence and equal diligence. After he had by daily lectures well grounded his pupils in Humanity, Logic, and Philosophy, and by frequent converse understood to what particular studies their parts might be most profitably applied, he gave them his advice accordingly; and, when they were able to go alone, he chose rather to set everyone his daily task than constantly to confine himself and them to precise hours for lectures. In the evening they all came to his chamber, to satisfy him that they had performed the task he had set them. The first question which he used to propound to every one in his order was, 'Quid dubitas?' 'What doubts have you met in your studies today?' for he supposed that to doubt nothing and to understand nothing were verifiable alike. Their questions being propounded, he resolved their quæres and so set them upon clear ground to proceed more distinctly; and then, having by prayer commended them and their studies to God's protection and blessing, he dismissed them to their lodgings.

Thus Milton and More might have come into unusually personal contact with Mead even though he was in no sense a tutor of either of them. His biographer says again (*ibid.*, III, 83):

He was far from affecting an unprofitable, inactive solitude; for none was more free and open for converse, especially with ingenuous and inquiring scholars. Let who would repair to him, provided they were not captious and impertinent, he would give them their fill of discourse and enlarge to ample satisfaction.

Read in connection with Mead's own life, the allegory of More's *Psychozoia* takes on a new meaning, for Mead had, in his youth, experienced a period of religious and philosophical doubt very similar to the situation Mnemon describes (*ibid.*, III, 74 ff.):

Not long after his entrance into philosophical studies, he was for some time disquieted with scepticism, that troublesome and restless disease of the Pyrrhonian school of old. For, lighting upon a book in some neighbor-scholar's chamber . . . he began, upon the perusal of it, to move strange questions to himself and even to doubt whether the τὸ πᾶν, the whole frame of things, as it appears to us, were any more than a mere phantasm or imagination. The improvement of this conceit . . . rendered all things so unpleasant to him, that his life became uncomfortable. He was then but young, and therefore the more capable of being abused by those perplexed motions, by which Pyrrho had industriously studied to represent the habitation of truth as inaccessible. But, by the mercy of God, he quickly made his way out of those troublesome labyrinths,

What more natural than that, in his intimate talks with students entering upon the period of adolescent doubt, he should have told them, allegorically or otherwise, the story of his youth, which More remembered so vividly?

More, it is true, pictures Mnemon as an old man, whereas Mead died in the prime of life, at the age of fifty-two. Yet More says himself that his figure of "ten times ten times ten" is a mere Pythagorean symbol, signifying the perfect life; then, too, conventions of the pastoral decree that the teacher-shepherd must be old; or may we possibly see here another evidence of the fact that to youth teachers are of a generation which has passed away! Apart from this one discrepancy, we may see a definite parallel between More's description of Mnemon, and a contemporary description of Mead. More says:<sup>7</sup>

. . . few things I will relate,  
Of which old Mnemon mention once did make.  
A jolly swain he was in youthfull state,  
When he mens natures gan to contemplate,  
And kingdomes view; but he was aged then  
When I him saw; his years bore a great date;  
He numbred had full ten times ten times ten;  
There's no Pythagorist but knows well what I mean.

Old Mnemons head and beard were hoary white,  
But yet a chearfull countenance he had:  
His vigorous eyes did shine like starres bright,  
And in good decent freez he was yclad.  
As blith and buxom as was any lad  
Of one and twenty cloth'd in forest green:  
Both blith he was and eek of counsell sad:  
Like winter-morn bedight with snow and rine  
And sunny rayes, so did his goodly Eldship shine.

In many of the details the description undoubtedly recalls this one of Mead:<sup>8</sup>

His body was of a comely proportion, rather of a tall than low stature. In his younger years (as he would say) he was but slender and spare of body; but afterwards, when he was full-grown, he became more fat and portly, yet not to any excess. . . . His eye was full, quick, and sparkling. His whole countenance was composed to a sedate seriousness and gravity;

<sup>7</sup> *Psychozoia*, Canto II, stanzas 30 and 31.

<sup>8</sup> *Biographia Evangelica*, III, 90.

*Majestas et Amor* were well met there: an awful majesty, but, withall, an inviting sweetness. His behavior was friendly and affable, intermixed with a becoming cheerfulness and inoffensive pleasantry. His complexion was a little swarthy, as if somewhat overtinctured with melancholy.

Whatever the other similarities between Mead and the mysterious Mnemon, there is no question that the lesson which each endeavored to teach to his students was the same:<sup>9</sup>

When Mnemon hither came, he leaned back  
Upon his seat, and a long time respired.  
When I perceived this holy Sage so slack  
To speak (well as I might) I him desired  
Still to hold on, if so he were not tired,  
And tell what fell in blest Theoprepy;  
But he nould do the thing that I required;  
Too hard it is, said he, that kingdomes glee  
To show; who list to know himself must come and see.

This story under the cool shadowing Beach  
Old Mnemon told of famous Dizoie;  
To set down all he said passeth my reach,  
That all would reach even to infinity.  
. . . Suffice it then (he) taught that ruling Right,  
The Good is uniform, the Evil infinite.

MARJORIE H. NICOLSON.

Goucher College.

#### THE SYNTAX OF *THE* WITH THE COMPARATIVE

There is in Old English a variation of the regular construction of comparison which may be indicated by the example, *ƿon mā ƿe*. This locution often baffles the translator and has usually been treated as sporadic in spite of the fact that it is to be found throughout the entire Old English period. It disappears in Middle English, the only trace left being the word, *lest*, *lest* (from *ƿȳ lās ƿe*). My discussion of the syntax of this construction falls under three heads: first, fixing the locution as an established *idiom* of Old English; second, the syntax of the pronoun, *ƿon*, (or *ƿȳ*, or *ƿē*) preceding the comparative; third, the syntax of the particle, *ƿe*, which follows the comparative. My analysis will incidentally

<sup>9</sup> *Psychozoia*, Canto III, stanzas 69, 70, 71.



throw light on that difficult fossil construction, Mod. Eng. *the* with comparative.

Examples of the idiom are not confined to any one dialect of Old English, nor to any single part of the period; this eliminates the possibility of scribal error to account for such a special use of the particle, *þe*.

From the poetry (ed. Grein-Wülker):

*Daniel* 264.—næs him se swæg to sorge ðon mā ðe sunnan scīma.

*Whale* 80.—nāgon hwyrft nē swice ūtsiþ æfre, þā þær in cumað, þon mā þe þā fiscas, faraðlācende, of þæs hwæles fenge hweorfan mōtan.

*Metres of Boethius* 28, 36.—ne bið hīo on æfen nē on ærmorgen merestrēame þē nēar þe on midne dæg.

*Metres of Boethius* 10, 38.—ne mæg mon æfre þȝ eð ænne wræccan his crafetes beniman þe mon oncerran mæg sunnan onswīfan.

*Psalms* 118, 11.—forðon ic on minre heortan hȳdde georne, þæt ic þīnre spræce spēð gehealde, þȝ lās ðe ic gefremme fyrene ænige.

From the prose:

*Saxon Chronicle* 755 (Parker).—þā cwædon hīe þæt hīe hīe þæs ne on-munden þon mā þe ēowre gefēran þe mid þām cyninge wærun. (Laud ms.—þonne mā þe).

*Saxon Chronicle* 1009 (Laud).—ac wē gȳt næfdon þā geselða nē þone wurðscipe þ seō scipfyrd nytt wære ðisum earde þē mā þe heo oftor ær wæs.

*Boethius, Consolation* xxxiv, 1 (Sedgfield, 83, 3).—næs of þām læssan þæt mæste þon (þē) mā þe sīo ēa mæg weorþan to æwelme.

*Ibid.* xxxiv, 10 (Sedgfield, 91, 12).—ne ðearft þū nō be þæm gesceaftum twēogan þon (þē) mā þe be þæm oþrum.

*King Edgar's Canon of Penitents* vii (Thorpe, *Laws and Institutes*, II, 280).—nē ænig man ne mæg synna būton andetnesse wel gebetan þē mā þe sē mæg wel hāl wurðan.

*Alfred's Martyrs*, Dec. 13 (ed. in *The Shrine*, Cockayne, 154, 22).—nis mē þīnes weales hāmed nāfre þē lēofre þe mē nēdre tō slite.

*Ælfric's Grammar, De Numero* (ed. Zupitza, 253).—and hī nāfre ne atēoriað on naðrum getele þē mā þe on cāsum.

*Ælfric's Lives* (Skeat) i, 7, 20.—and þæra mādma ne rōhte þē mā þe rēocendes meoxes.

*Ælfric's Homilies, Shrove Sunday*, (Thorpe) i, 154, 18.—nis heo hwæðere ðē geliocre ðære ēcan worulde, þe is sum cweartern lēohtum dæge.

Wūlfing (*Syntax Alfred*, § 65, 3) cites the following from Alfred:—

*Cura Past.* (ed. Sweet) 309, 3.—ðonne ne burne se weliga ðē swiður on ðære tungan ðe on oðrum limum.

*Ibid.* 318, 18.—ðæt hīe . . . ne hīe selfe ðȝ betran ne talien þe ðā oðre.

*Boethius* (ed. Cardale) 48, 22.—*þon mā þe þū wistest.*

*Similarly, ibid.* 340, 20; 364, 4.

*Ibid.* 232, 8.—*þē mā þe be þēm ȝprum.*

*Similarly, ibid.* 288, 10.

*Ibid.* 282, 23.—*ne biþ se cwuca þonne nyttra þe se dēada.*

*Soliloquies St. Augustine* (ed. Cöckayne) 201, 34.—*hē . . . þeah ne  
þinȝ ūs hwilum þē brādder þe ān scyld.*

*Laus of Alfred* (ed. Schmid) 76, 2 (ed. Thorpe) 1, 66 (ms. E).—*gif hīo  
bearn gestriene, næbbe þæt þæs ierfes þon māre þe sīo mōdor.  
(ms. B.—nā māre þonne sēo mōdor.)*

The general form of this idiom may be represented as

*þon* (or *þȳ*, or *þē*) + comparative + *þe* (relative particle).<sup>1</sup>

As far as I can determine, the idiom does not occur in any other language than English. In Old Saxon *than mer the* occurs (cf. *Heliant*, 1395), but it is not our English idiom at all; it is there used in a proportional statement and not in the comparison of inequality.

This quasi-comparative use of the particle, *þe*, occurs only twice to my knowledge without the preceding *þon* (*þē*, *þȳ*).<sup>2</sup> We are dealing, therefore, with a construction quite different syntactically from ordinary comparison. The fact is that in the idiom under discussion both the preceding *þon* and the following *þe* are together equivalent to the particle, *þonne*, of the regular construction. It is to be noticed that most of the examples are formed on *mā* (*māra*), and that with *mā* and *lēs* the expression became

<sup>1</sup> The chance occurrence of *þe* after the comparative in the meaning, "who," "which," or "because," to introduce a relative clause or a subordinate clause other than the clause of comparison, should not be confused with the idiom under discussion. Such chance occurrences are *Beowulf* 488, 1436, 2880; *Genesis* 1325; *Metres of Boethius* x, 20 and xii, 20.

<sup>2</sup> The sole example of *þe* after the comparative in the *Saxon Chronicle* without a preceding *þon* (*þē*, *þȳ*): namely, 901 A. D. (Parker ms.), *lēs þe xxx*, is probably a scribal error for the regular *þonne* or *þanne*. Compare *ibid.* 1048, *mā þanne XX*. The only other example in Old English of which I am aware occurs in *Blickling Homilies*, *BETS*, 58, p. 215:—*twōm lēs þe twēntig wintra*. But compare *Saxon Chronicle* 641, *hē riāode twā lēs XXX gēara*; and 643, *sē wæs discop ān lēs XX wintra ond II mōnðas*, where the comparative particle is omitted altogether. All of these may be due to careless copying of manuscripts.

stereotyped and as a consequence more difficult to analyze. For instance, *þý læs þe*, which is the etymological basis of Modern English *lest*, had by the end of the Old English period lost its connotation of comparison and by giving up the recognition of its separate parts had assumed the shade of meaning bound up in Modern English *lest*.<sup>3</sup>

Translators and grammarians have treated this idiom as merely an irregular sort of substitute for the formula of comparison; none have recognized it as a locution enjoying wide use in Old English; and no attempt has been made to analyze the construction syntactically.<sup>4</sup> Being confined to Old English, it probably arose some time before the earliest records, flourished in a limited degree beside the regular construction of comparison without ever becoming a serious rival, and appears in the literature in the stage of decline, gradually disappearing. Naturally, it persisted longest in the stereotyped forms with *mā* and *læs*, but in these forms, like all fossilized expressions, it underwent a shift in meaning from that originally implied in the constituent elements.<sup>5</sup>

## II

I shall now examine the common construction of *þon* (or *þē*, or *þý*) plus the comparative, which constitutes a part of our idiom. Representative examples are:

*Saxon Chronicle* 937 (Parker ms., *Brunanburh* 43).—*gelpan ne þorfte beorn blandenfeax bilgeslehtes, eald inwidda, nē Anlāf þý mā.* ("nor Anlaf more than that one: namely, the previously mentioned Constantinus").

*Elena* 96.—*Cyning wæs þý bliðra ond þē sorglēasra, secga aldor, on fyrhðsefan þurh þā fāgeran gesyhð.* ("The king, the chief of men,

<sup>3</sup> For example, in the verse cited above from the *Psalms* (118, 11) the clause introduced by *þý læs þe* means simply "lest I should commit any sin."

<sup>4</sup> Mätzner (*Englische Grammatik*, 3rd ed., III, 554), who gives this construction more attention than any other writer, goes as far as to say that in Old English *þe* may be substituted for *þonne* after the comparative. But he does not take into account the pronoun, *þon*, which precedes and which is an integral part of this idiom.

<sup>5</sup> For a statement of the doctrine of the shift in meaning of conjunctive elements see my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins), pp. 133 ff.

was happier than he was before and more care-free (in his mind) than before, because of that fair vision.")

*Azarias* 86.—Næfre hlisan āh meotud þon māran, þonne hē wið monna bearn wyrceð weldædum. ("more glory than that: namely, when he performs good deeds.") \*

*Alfred's Orosius* (ed. *EETS* 79) 100, 16.—Ic sceal ēac þȳ later Rōmāna istōria āsecgan þe ic angunnen hæfde. ("I shall next after that [literally, "later than that"] relate the history of Rome that I had begun.")

*Alfred's Gregory's Pastoral Care* (*EETS* 45) 96, 6.—sē þe oferspræce bið, hē bið nōhte ðon læs mid ðære besmiten, ("He who is a slanderer, he himself is defiled therewith not a bit less than that one [whom he slanders].")

As an illustration of the difficulty offered in the usual interpretation of these so-called instrumental forms (*þon*, *þē*, *þȳ*), see Delbrück's remarks (*Synkretismus* 160) where he struggles with the passage in *Elena* just cited above, line 96. He is uncertain as to what interpretation to put upon *þȳ* and *þē* and makes two suggestions, neither of which is based upon a recognition of the broader aspects of this idiom. He offers to translate the instrumental forms as either "um so" or "dadurch." To translate *þȳ* *blīðra* and *þē* *sorglēasra* as "happier and more carefree by that much" gives no meaning to the context because there is no previous measure to be referred to that could serve as the antecedent of measure, and *þȳ* (or *þē*) is useless without an antecedent. Delbrück offers also "dadurch" as an instrumental of means, if the instrumental of measure should not fit. "Happier by that means" is clearly out of the question here, since the phrase, *þurh þā fāgeran gesyhd*, covers that aspect of the situation fully and explicitly. Such free conjecturing upon one example does not lead to the basic meaning of the idiom; the matter is again in doubt as soon as the context is changed.

It is apparent that in some examples of this construction we have the comparative formula *in toto* and are not left suspended in mid-air, as is often the case if *þon*, *þȳ*, and *þē* are construed invariably as instrumental of *measure* or *means*. The three forms are recognized in Old English as interchangeable instrumental

\*The *Sprachschatz* (Grein-Wülker, p. 719) makes this sentence unintelligible by its emendation, *þan*, instead of the ms. reading, *þon*.

forms of the demonstrative pronoun, but the syncrétism of cases in West Germanic that brought about that condition has not been explained and it is impossible to distinguish the shade of instrumental meaning in each. The context must be the guide, and many of these occurrences before the comparative, by referring back to a fact or condition previously mentioned as the *basis for comparison*, serve to complete the formula of comparison and are in fact, *instrumentals of comparison*.<sup>7</sup> It is significant to observe at this juncture that Brugmann [*Grundriss* II (2), 542] takes the instrumental as the fundamental case of comparison.

Thus, the Anglo-Saxon felt that the comparative formula was quite complete with only the instrumental *þon* (*þē*, *þū*). One is conscious, in reading the many examples of *þon sēl*, *þū bliðra*, *þū mā*, *þū lās*, etc., that these expressions had become stereotyped even in Old English, and that the modern *He is not one whit the better for his experience* is essentially the Old English idiom itself. There is a certain finality about it in Old English that makes it practically a substitute for the regular comparative construction.

If one should ask in these examples, "Better than what?" "Happier than what?" "More than what?" one would find that the idiom invariably points back to some condition or fact previously mentioned or *plainly understood*. In the passage from *Elena* just quoted (96 ff.) the poet has been emphasizing the fear in the mind of Constantine owing to the vast hordes opposed to him in battle. *Cyning wæs āfyrhted, egsan geāclād, . . . hæfde wigena tō lýt.* (56) Then the poet has Constantine see the vision of the cross in a dream. Upon awaking the king is greatly comforted and the strong contrast with his previous condition is brought out succinctly: *Cyning wæs þū bliðra ond þē sorglēasra.* Similarly in *Brunanburh* (43) the circuit of comparison is com-

<sup>7</sup> Behaghel, in his *Modi im Heliand*, 38, remarks that the comparative construction is seldom complete according to the strict grammatical requirements, and cites as anacoluthon: *Heliand* 536,—*so it gio mari ni warth than widor an thesaro weroldi*, and *Heliand* 1515,—*so huie so it ofto duot, so wirðit is simla wirsa, huand hie im gewardon ni mag.* These cases are similar to those under discussion here and illustrate how the basis of comparison may often be implied instead of expressed.



pleted by reference to the condition of *Costontinus* just previously mentioned.

In the passage from *Cura Pastoralis* cited above the basis of comparison is *sē* (*ofersprāce*) and the passage provides proof that *ðon* cannot be the instrumental of measure, because *nōhte* immediately preceding *ðon* is itself the instrumental of measure ("not less by a particle"): there is no possibility of an additional vague measure, "by so much," or "by that much," and *ðon* cannot be forced into that construction. Similarly *Beowulf* 2277,—*ne bið him wihte ðy sēl*, and *Metres of Boethius* (Grein-Wülker), 9, 32,—*micle þē bliðra*, to cite only two more of the many examples of this well known construction, show plainly that the instrumental of the demonstrative pronoun is useless here if forced into a vague sort of *measure* without antecedent.

Although grammarians and translators have generally been satisfied to refer such examples to the instrumental of measure or of means, they have always avoided exact translation, using some such harmless adverb as *much*, or omitting the demonstrative altogether. They have been conscious, perhaps, that *measure* and *means* have no significance in the context, as anyone may see who reads it closely. The full force of this idiom is lost through failure to recognize the instrumental of comparison. The occurrence in the *Saxon Chronicle* 1047 (Laud ms.),—*ond Ulf þ cōm þær tō ond fōr nēah man sceolde tō brecah his stef gif hē ne sealde þē māre gersuman*, brings this out plainly. Shall we say, "He was threatened with removal from office if he did not bestow more gifts *by that*, or *by so much*?" Neither makes sense; the point of the narrative is that the bishop had in the preceding years failed to grant gifts of land and money as generously as he was expected to do, and there was naturally an agitation to have him replaced by another "if he did not bestow more gifts than that": that is, "more gifts than in the past."

Consider also *Alfred's Bede* (ed. Grein) 481, 17,—*ðā wæron hī ðē baldran gewordene* (*solito confidentiores facti*). Miller, *EETS* 95, translates "they were emboldened by this." The Latin *solito* is plainly the ablative of comparison, and we have literally "bolder than what is usual,"—"bolder than usual." The Old English translator uses the comparative, *baldra*, to render the Latin com-

parative, *confidentiores*, showing that he took the Latin literally and not as an intensive expression meaning "uncommonly bold."<sup>8</sup> Miller's translation represents the usual slighting of the demonstrative before the comparative. Modern English *the* could properly be used to render Old English *þon* (*þȳ*, *þē*), though many translators avoid it. I do not use it in the present analysis because, having survived from Old English, it is of course a part of my problem; besides, it is stereotyped in its use before the comparative, and, having its function obscured, would cause confusion.

The syncretism involved in the instrumental case in Germanic is one of the less adequately explained features of the grammar. What functions of the Indo-European instrumental went over into the dative, and exactly what functions survive in the fragmentary remains of the instrumental in Germanic cannot be stated with certainty. The substantive class early merged the instrumental with the dative: *dæge* is both instrumental and dative, and the marking of the instrumental termination *-e* long to distinguish it from the dative, which was begun by Grimm and continued by Grein, is not warranted by the mss. according to Delbrück (*Synkretismus* p. 153). In the strong adjective the instrumental is sometimes given its distinctive form: *gode* beside *godum*,—but the dative form predominates taking over the functions of the instrumental. Of the two Germanic instrumental terminations *-i* and *-u*, Old English preferred *-i* according to Delbrück (*Synkretismus*, p. 164), although there are traces of the other. This instrumental *-i* and the old dative *æ* both became *e* in early Old English. The demonstrative and the interrogative pronouns alone seem to retain distinct instrumental forms. Wright (*Old Engl.*

<sup>8</sup> The Latin comparative ending loses its force in certain locutions even as early as the classical period according to some authorities, and certainly by the Late Latin period. Compare my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins), p. 61; Bennett, *Latin Grammar*, § 240; Wölfflin, *Lateinische und romanische Comparation* 63; Hammesfahr, *Zur Comparation im Altfranzösischen* 4; Knüpfer, *Anfänge periphrastischen Komparation im Englischen*, *Engl. Stud.* 55, 382. Thus, some would read *solito confidentiores* as "uncommonly bold." But in Old English the comparative termination shows no weakening, remaining a strong, conscious mark of gradation down to Modern English. Therefore, since the Anglo-Saxon translator uses the comparative *balðra* there can be no doubt that he takes the Latin construction at its full value.

*Gram.* 2nd ed., p. 235) cites *ðon* and *ðȳ* as instrumental, merely remarking that they are "difficult to explain satisfactorily." Delbrück (*Synkretismus* 154) gives *ðȳ* (*ðis*, *ðȳs*) and *hwȳ* (*hwī*) as the only fully established instrumental forms. Others would place OE. *þē* in the category of true instrumentals, and even *þon* is often so understood.

It must be said that there is no adequate authority for placing *þon* as primarily instrumental. That it came into the dative and the instrumental in certain constructions is very evident, and in such constructions as *þon mā*, *þon lās*, *sīþ þon*, we are dealing with Primitive Germanic locutions. Compare Gothic *panamais*, *panaseiþs*; Old Icelandic *en meira*; Old Saxon *than mer*, *than hluttran*; Old High German *dana halt*, *dana mer*. Sievers, in the successive editions of his *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, § 337, takes *þon mā* to mean "mehr als das," thus favoring such a completed formula of comparison as I have indicated above. Sievers, however, does not discuss the difficulty. Dietrich (*Haupts Zeits.* XI, 405) long ago showed that OE. *þon* and *hwon* were probably originally Germanic accusatives (*þana* > *þone* > *þon*), and Johansson (*Betz. Beiträge* XVI, 158) considered *þana* of *panamais*, *panaseiþs*, as accusative in form without committing himself as to function. Behaghel (*Zeitformen*, p. 176) attempts to connect *þana* of *panamais* with the comparative particle, *þanne*, *danne* by conjecturing that we have here an old ablative ending *-a*: he does not go into an explanation of his view and there seems to be no adequate support for it. The *Sprachschatz* (Grein-Wülker, p. 719) favors a completed comparative construction in such cases, giving the demonstrative, *þon*, the meaning "von da aus gerechnet,—im Vergleich damit"; but it is non-committal as to exact function.

The construction in Old Saxon has been interpreted in exactly the way I advocate for English. Examples are:—

*Heliand* 536,—so it gio mari ni warth *than widor* an thesaro weroldi.

*Heliand* 974,—that he ni spraki thero wordo *than mer*.

*Heliand* 2127,—the gelobon habdi *than hluttran* te himile.

Behaghel (*Syntax im Heliand* 125) remarks that the demonstrative *than* in such cases "auf die verglichene Grösse zurückweist." That is to say, it refers back to some object or magnitude with which comparison is to be made. If the previous magnitude or

condition is well understood as being set up as a standard of comparison, then the construction cannot mean "greater, or more, *by that much*" (instr. of measure) nor can it mean "greater, or broader, *through that, by means of that*" (instr. of means). It can be interpreted only as meaning "greater, or broader, or louder, *than that or than before.*" We have in this construction, as Behaghel's analysis indicates, the completed formula of comparison. See the Introduction to my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins, 1924) for the basic meaning of comparison.

In the syncretism that produced such a variety of forms in the instrumental case of the demonstrative pronoun in Old English (*þȳ, þi, þē, þon*) there was also a running together of functions and a leveling out, so that these various forms, having originally different functions and different meanings, became interchangeable. It is not to be assumed, of course, that *all* occurrences of *þon, þȳ, þē* are to be interpreted in the light of the idiom under discussion, but I take the position that in many examples of demonstrative pronoun plus comparative in Old English we must recognize an *instrumental of comparison*, functioning in the same way as the regular dative of comparison. (Latin, ablative; Greek, genitive; Sanskrit, ablative and instrumental.) We may, perhaps, go as far as to say that in the complex syncretism of forms associated with the instrumental case in Germanic, there was a survival of an Indo-European instrumental of comparison.<sup>9</sup>

Let us glance at this instrumental of the demonstrative pronoun in Modern English. It precedes the comparative just as it did in Old English, and in my opinion this use of Modern English *the* is still a clear example of the instrumental of comparison.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Compare Brugmann, *Grundriss* II (2), 542; *Indogerman. Forschungen* 27, 159; Speyer, *Vedische und Skt. Syntax*, p. 12; and Pischel, *Götting. gel. Anzeiger* 1884 (13), 512, for the well established instrumental of comparison in Sanskrit, Lithuanian, and Irish. Brugmann considers it the fundamental case of comparison in Indo-European. For the instrumental of comparison in Old High German and in Old Saxon, see respectively Delbrück, *Synkretismus*, p. 200, and Behagel, *Syntax im Heliand*, 126.

<sup>10</sup> The construction under discussion at this point should be distinguished from at least two others in Modern English in which *the* precedes the comparative. In "He is *the* happier of the two," the word, *the*, is simply the definite article. In "*The* more, *the* merrier," the word *the* is the instru-

1. This soldier's marksmanship is *a great deal* the better for (on account of) his constant practice.
2. His marksmanship is not *any* the better for his constant practice.

In these sentences *a great deal* and *any* are clearly instrumental of measure and the phrase, *for his constant practice*, is in both sentences the instrumental of means. The object of comparison is the former condition of the soldier in question. Let us now express the object of comparison by a clause.

3. This soldier's marksmanship is *a great deal* better than that of his comrades on account of his constant practice.
4. His marksmanship is not *any* better than that of his comrades in spite of his constant practice.

In these two sentences we are not referred back to the soldier's previous condition for the object of comparison; we look forward to the "than" clause. We still have the instrumental of measure and of means expressed as in the first two sentences, but to retain the word, *the*, before the comparative when the clause of comparison is expressed, as in 3 and 4, is absolutely impossible in English syntax.

If, as is commonly held by the authorities, the pronoun, *the*, be merely a vague instrumental of measure or of means without antecedent (at first meaning "by so much," then becoming a general intensive), why can it not be used in a sentence of the second type (3 and 4)? The truth is that this demonstrative pronoun before the comparative takes the place of the clause of comparison, referring back to a previous condition or fact just expressed or plainly understood, and is to be interpreted literally, "than that." Whenever the comparison is not made with a former condition, or with a fact just previously stated, the instrumental of comparison, *the*, is not needed and cannot be used. Sentence 1 means, then, "This soldier's marksmanship is *a great deal* better than that (than it

mental of measure, and the meaning is "By whatever amount more, by that amount is it merrier." But the construction I am studying may be illustrated by the sentence, "He labored hard in his youth, and now he is *a great deal the* healthier for it." The word *the* is here considered by all the authorities to be the instrumental of measure or of means. If my conclusions are correct, however, *the* is the instrumental of comparison. The word, *deal*, is the instrumental of measure, and the word, *it*, is the instrumental of means.



was) on account of his constant practice"; and similarly in example 2 the reference is to a former condition. I have never seen an example of this construction in any period of English in which this did not hold true.<sup>11</sup>

Beginning, then, with a Primitive Germanic construction, which may be posited on the strength of Gothic *þanamaiz*, *þanaseiþs*, Old Icelandic *þa en meira*, Old English *þon (þan) mā*, etc., Old High German *dana mer*, *dana halt*, Old Saxon *than mer*, *than hluttran*, and coming down to present-day English, we find that the demonstrative pronoun in our idiom had reference to a fact or condition with which comparison was to be made and was in function an instrumental of comparison. At first referring to a definite antecedent it gradually became stereotyped, either having a definitely expressed antecedent or pointing back to a condition plainly implied.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The *NED* under *the* (demonstrative pronoun) in attempting to explain this construction attributes almost every *instrumental* function to *the* excepting comparison, but fails to make function and meaning agree in this little word. It ends by assuming a hypothetical development in the idiom to account for its present "pleonastic" form. To quote: "The radical meaning is 'in or by that,' 'in or by so much,' e. g. 'if you sow them now, they will come up the sooner'; 'he has a holiday, and looks the better,' to which the pleonastic 'for it' has been added, and the sentence at length turned into 'he looks the better for his holiday.'" Such a theory may easily be refuted by pointing to the construction in line 96 of the *Elena*, cited above. The phrase, *þurh þa fægeran gesyhhþ*, functions as the instrumental of means corresponding to the phrase "for it" (i. e. "through it") of the examples in *NED*. If there be any pleonasm, it has existed from the very beginning; for this is one idiom in Modern English that has persisted from our earliest records without a particle of change either in function or in meaning. There is no pleonasm, however, since the demonstrative refers to a former condition or magnitude as the basis of comparison, and the means ("through, or by, or for something") and measure (*micle*, *nohte*, "by far," "a whit," "somewhat") are properly added to shade off the comparison.

<sup>12</sup> The finality of the construction is nowhere more markedly shown than in our present-day use where one feels that the demonstrative, *the*, completes the circuit of comparison perfectly, without holding in suspense some unexpressed clause of comparison. In the sentence, "He is a great deal stronger" one must mentally supply the clause "than he was." If one says, however, "He is a great deal the stronger," the circuit is somehow felt to be complete and no clause can be supplied, mentally or

## III

If we now return to the full idiom, *pon mā þe*, etc., which was set forth in its various forms at the beginning of this article, we shall find that we are prepared to interpret the particle *þe* that follows the comparative.

The few grammarians who have noticed this idiom at all (mentioned above) have tried in one way or another to connect it with the comparative particle, *than*, because like *than* it serves to introduce the clause of comparison.

*Daniel* 264,—*næs him se swæg to sorge ðon mā ðe sunnan scīma.*

*Metres of Boethius* 28, 36,—*ne bið hīo on æfen nē on ærmorgen mere-  
strēame þē nēar þe on midne dæg.*

Taking *pon* (*þȳ*, *þē*) as the instrumental of measure or of means before the comparative, which is usually insisted upon, one is forced to read into the following *þe* all the meaning and function of the regular comparative particle, *þonne*. There is no evidence to show that *þe* is a writing for *þonne* in Old English, nor can scribal errors account for so many occurrences over so long a period. The particle, *þe*, is clearly the ordinary relative particle, and it is not necessary to give it the meaning of the comparative particle, *þonne*, which must be done if the preceding demonstrative pronoun, *pon* (*þȳ*, *þē*), is to be taken as instrumental of measure or means: *Daniel* 264,—“To them the roaring flame was not *any* (a *whit*) more harmful *than* sunshine (is).”

Since, however, the circuit of comparison is grammatically complete in the demonstrative pronoun plus the comparative, as I have demonstrated in the preceding section, we may take the following particle, *þe*, in one of its established functions of introducing substantive clauses. This, in my opinion, gives the true syntactical analysis of our idiom and reveals the basic meaning: *Daniel* 264,—“To them the roaring flame was no more harmful *than this* (*næs þon mā*), namely, (*þe*) sunshine,” or, “than this, namely, what sunshine is.” *Metres of Boethius* 28, 36,—“Neither in the even-

otherwise. This is, of course, no scientific argument in favor of my position; but the feeling to-day that no clause of comparison can follow the comparative if the demonstrative, *the*, precedes clinches the conclusions I have drawn from historical grammar.

ing nor at dawn is it (the sun) nearer to the sea than this (*þē nēar*), namely, (*þe*) its distance at noon," or, "what it is at noon." Thus, the demonstrative pronoun and the relative particle, *þon* . . . *þe*, *þȳ* . . . *þe*, or *þē* . . . *þe*, are together equivalent to the comparative particle, *than* (*þonne*); however, the function of comparison lies not in the relative particle<sup>13</sup> but in the preceding demonstrative pronoun, *þon* (*þȳ*, *þē*), functioning as an instrumental of comparison.

GEORGE WILLIAM SMALL.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

### A CHAUCERIAN ECHO IN SPENSER

Upton<sup>1</sup> long ago suggested that Spenser, in his famous description of the House of Pride (*Faerie Queene*, I, iv), may have had in mind Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*. In that case, it would be reasonable to suppose that he might transfer from it a definite picture.

We recall that, as the "glitterand" *Lucifera* sits in state upon her throne, the people "thronging in the hall, Doe ride each other upon her to gaze." Similarly, Chaucer's people "in a corner of the halle . . . clamben up on othere faste" in order to behold the mysterious stranger whose identity, it is hoped, will forever lie in the dark backward and abysm of time. The two descriptions are as follows:

#### THE HOUS OF FAME.

I herde a gret noise withalle  
In a corner of the halle,

. . . . .

<sup>13</sup> This peculiar function of the particle, *þe*, in converting a demonstrative pronoun or demonstrative adverb into something like a relative conjunction [in this case giving to the demonstrative, *þon* (*þȳ*, *þē*), the relative force of the subordinate conjunction of comparison, *than*] is one of the formative processes in the development of subordinate conjunctions in English. For a full treatment of this subject with bibliography, see Appendix B of my *Comparison of Inequality* (Johns Hopkins, 1924), especially pp. 148 ff.

<sup>1</sup> *The Faerie Queene*, London, 1758, II, 367.

And whan they were alle on an hepe,  
 Tho behinde gonne up lepe,  
 And clamben up on othere faste.<sup>2</sup>

THE HOUSE OF PRIDE.

The heapes of people, thronging in the hall,  
 Doe ride each other upon her to gaze.<sup>3</sup>

As for the word *heapes*, H. M. Percival<sup>4</sup> glosses in this way:

'Crowd'; this use of the word, lately revived as a colloquialism, is old: *Piers Plowman*, Prol. 53, "Heremites on an heep . . . wenten to Walsyng-ham"; V, 233, "An hep of chapmen"; and is the common meaning of Germ. *haufen*.

Its use in the above passage, however, may have been due to Chaucer's "on an hepe" in a parallel context.<sup>5</sup>

ROBERT R. CAWLEY.

Princeton University.

---

THE "LUCY" POEMS

The poems of Wordsworth usually grouped as the "Lucy" poems are: *Strange fits of passion have I known; She dwelt among the untrodden ways; I travelled among unknown men; Three years she grew in sun and shower; and A slumber did my spirit seal. Lucy Gray* should, I think, be included as the basis for the others. Thus considered, a plausible solution of the question of Lucy's identity, which has troubled readers for more than a hundred years, suggests itself.

<sup>2</sup> Skeat's *Student's Chaucer*, 2141-51.

<sup>3</sup> *Faerie Queene*, I, iv, 16, 7-8.

<sup>4</sup> *The Faerie Queene, Book I*, London and New York, 1893, p. 219.

<sup>5</sup> It is interesting that the poet uses *heaped* in a similar description which has been compared with *The Squires Tale*, 189 ff.:

(I, xii, 9, 1-3) "And after all the raskall many ran,  
*Heaped* together in rude rablement,  
 To see the face of that victorious man."

And in two other places (IV, iii, 41, 4; V, v, 5, 8), nearly the only ones where he uses *heapes* specifically in the sense of *crowds of people*, the picture is that of men pushing eagerly forward to catch a glimpse of some famous person.

Can it be shown that the actual event which originated *Lucy Gray*, suggested also the others, and that they are all of one cloth? The poet's note to *Lucy Gray* reads:

Written at Goslar in Germany. It was founded on a circumstance told me by my sister, of a little girl, who, not far from Halifax in Yorkshire, was bewildered in a snow-storm. Her foot-steps were traced by her parents to the middle of the lock of a canal, and no other vestige of her, backward or forward, could be traced. The body however was found in the canal.

*Lucy Gray* was written at approximately the same time and place as the five usually known as the "Lucy" poems. My idea is that the poet, being deeply impressed with this happening, wrote not only the poem *Lucy Gray*, but a series of poems dealing with Lucy at different ages, all having in common the thought of her untimely death.

With this idea in mind, let us examine the poems. In *Lucy Gray*, Lucy is a child of unknown age, a "little girl." The incident is related nearly as it was told to Wordsworth by his sister. In the other poems, the five "Lucy" poems, Lucy has grown to womanhood. She has a lover. In one, the lover fears that she will die; in the other four, he laments her death. "The springs of Dove"<sup>1</sup> are in Yorkshire. Wordsworth's note to *Lucy Gray* shows that the incident which occasioned that poem took place in Yorkshire. The real connection between the incident of *Lucy Gray* and the writing of the five others is the common theme of the death of the heroine.

In regard to *Lucy Gray*, Dowden observes that, "The chief departure from the real incident is that Lucy Gray's body is not found; this gives opportunity for the rumors that she is still alive, and the supposed confirmation of these rumors by her apparition on the wild."<sup>2</sup> This slight change in the incident not only adds charm to the poem, but may have some bearing on Wordsworth's renewal of the incident in still different forms in the "Lucy" group.

The poem, *Three years she grew in sun and shower* is the story

<sup>1</sup> *She dwelt among the untrodden ways*, line 2.

<sup>2</sup> Dowden, Edward, ed., *Poems by Wordsworth*, note on *Lucy Gray*, p. 375.



of how Lucy, with nature as guide, grows to womanhood. It is in this poem that nature says:

This child I to myself will take;  
She shall be mine, and I will make  
A lady of my own.

So nature completes her education, being both "law and impulse";

And vital feelings of delight  
Shall rear her form to stately height  
Her virgin bosom swell;  
Such thoughts to Lucy I will give  
While she and I together live  
Here in this happy dell.  
Thus Nature spake—the work was done.

The work was done. Nature had made a lady of the little girl. There is nothing in the remaining four poems of the group incompatible with the age attained in this poem.

To sum up, then, the Lucy of the "Lucy" poems is none other than the Lucy of *Lucy Gray*. These poems have their basis in fact, an incident related to Wordsworth by his sister. The incident has been colored by the imagination of the poet, and a series of poems, having the heroine at different ages, has been produced. This method of taking an incident from real life and coloring it with imagination is the one commonly followed by Wordsworth. We have no reason to suppose that he departed from his custom in this instance. The original poem is *Lucy Gray*. The "Lucy" group of five has a theme in common, the untimely death of the girl and the lamentation of her lover. There is no hidden, mysterious person to seek. All the scenes are in England. All the internal evidence of the poems points to the home of the heroine of *Lucy Gray* as the scene of the group.

WALTER PENNINGTON.

*Northwestern University.*

---

## A NOTE ON 'CORONES TWO'

In two articles written several years ago (*PMLA*. 26, 315 ff. and 29, 129 ff.), Professor Lowes explained the symbolism of the 'corones two' of Chaucer's *Second Nun's Tale* and cited illustrations of the widespread use of this symbolism. Another illustration is to be found in a stanzaic version of the *Life of St. Anne*, an edition of which I have in process of preparation, contained in the University of Minnesota MS. Z. 822, N. 81 (formerly Phillipps MS. 8122).

The Virgin Mary, who has been brought up in the temple, has reached the age of twelve years and has been told by the council of bishops that she should now marry. But she refuses marriage and explains her refusal as follows:

Scho answerde hym þan full myldly  
 & sayd: seruay here ensempyll why,  
 Als 3e may wrytyn se.  
 Abell, þat cursyd kayn slogh,  
 Lyfs now in heuen wit yoy enoght;  
 And two corones haues he.  
 One had he for hys martyrdom,  
 Another he had hym best becom  
 Ffor hys vergynte.  
 And Ely ravyst to heuen es  
 For he keped hym in clenness:  
 Swylk grace may god send me.

(ll. 445-456)

This manuscript was written about the time of Chaucer's death, but the poem narrating the *Life of St. Anne* is a copy of an older original. The source of this poem, it should be added, and probably the source of the whole medieval conception of the symbolism of the two crowns of martyrdom and virginity, is the apocryphal *Pseudo-Matthaei Evangelium*, Cap. VII:

Tunc Abiathar obtulit munera infinita pontificibus, ut acciperet eam filio suo tradendam uxorem. Prohibebat autem Maria dicens: Non potest fieri ut ego virum cognoscam aut me vir cognoscat. Pontifices autem et omnes eius affines dicebant ei: Deus in filiis colitur et in posteris adoratur, sicut semper fuit in Israel. Respondens autem Maria dixit illis: Deus in castitate primo omnium colitur, ut comprobatur. Nam ante Abel nullus

fuit iustus inter homines, et iste pro oblatione placuit deo, et ab eo qui displicuit inclementer occisus est. Duas tamen coronas accepit, oblationis et virginitatis, quia in carne sua nunquam pollutionem admisit. Denique et Helias cum esset in carne assumptus est, quia carnem suam virginem custodivit. Haec ego didici in templo dei ab infantia mea, quod deo cara esse possit virgo. Ideo hoc statui in corde meo ut vinum penitus non cognoscam.

(Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, p. 65)

ROSCOE E. PARKER.

University of California.

---

### TINTINNABULATION

At page 281 in *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, Professor Campbell has the following note:

Perhaps a coinage of Poe's out of Latin *tintinnabulum*; no earlier example of its use is recorded by either the *Oxford Dictionary* or the *Century Dictionary*. Whitty (p. 233) quotes a passage from Poulson's *Daily Advertiser* concerning bells (found, so he states, among the clippings in an old "Marginalia" book kept by Poe) in which the word *Tintin-nabula* appears.

If Poe ever read any of the editions of John Hookham Frere's *Monks and Giants*, as Byron did, he might well have noted the following from the first edition of 1817. Canto III:

With tintinnabular uproar were astounded, (Stanza xvii.)  
Tune in triumpho fracto tintinnabulo, (xxv.)  
Et fregit tintinnabulum lapide jacto, (xxvi.)  
Himself an anti-tintinnabularian, (xxx.)  
Thronged in the hallow tintinnabularian hive, (xlii.)

As for the sources cited by Professor Campbell (pp. 280-281), it seems safe to say that the three Latin stanzas "transcribed" by Frere from "An ancient monkish record" contain quite as much or quite as little to inspire the genius of Poe.

C. B. COOPER.

Armour Institute of Technology.

---

## ANOTHER FORGOTTEN NOVEL

In the early eighties, John Hay, Republican, wrote a novel, fourth rate at best—a thesis novel called *The Breadwinners*,<sup>1</sup> in which he defended capital. This novel he was moved to write by the riots of 1877, the climax year of the Northern Pacific Panic. It is mentioned by the better historians of American Literature, and sometimes placed on reserve in college libraries. But that is just half the tale. The other half, for reasons it is not impossible to discover, has remained generally unknown.

There was an answer to *The Breadwinners*—*The Money-Makers*<sup>2</sup> by Henry F. Keenan—which, although it is unquestionably better than *The Breadwinners*, has been overlooked. One looks in vain for the title in DuBreuil,<sup>3</sup> Van Doren,<sup>4</sup> Speare,<sup>5</sup> Pattee,<sup>6</sup> and the *Cambridge History*.<sup>7</sup> One looks in vain also in the magazine indexes and in the index of the *New York Tribune*. Of the biographers of Hay, Mr. Sears<sup>8</sup> says nothing about it and Mr. Thayer<sup>9</sup> dismisses it with the brief comment that it “achieved notoriety.” Only one man, so far as I can discover—Mr. William Montgomery Clemens, editor of the *Biblio*—has given it anything like the consideration it deserves.<sup>10</sup>

The principal reason *The Money-Makers* has remained in obscurity seems to be that John Hay suppressed it. The character of

<sup>1</sup> Published anonymously by Harper, New York, 1883.

<sup>2</sup> Published anonymously by D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1885.

<sup>3</sup> *The Novel in Democracy in America*, by Alice Jouveau DuBreuil, J. H. Furst Co., Baltimore, 1923.

<sup>4</sup> *The American Novel*, by Carl Van Doren, Macmillan, New York, 1921.

<sup>5</sup> *The Political Novel, Its Development in England and in America*, by Morris E. Speare, Oxford University Press, New York, 1924.

<sup>6</sup> *A History of American Literature since 1870*, by Fred Lewis Pattee, Century Co., New York, 1921.

<sup>7</sup> *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, Putnam, New York, 1921.

<sup>8</sup> *John Hay, Author and Statesman*, by Lorenzo Sears, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, 1914.

<sup>9</sup> *The Life and Letters of John Hay*, by William Roscoe Thayer, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1915.

<sup>10</sup> *How John Hay Suppressed a First Edition*, by Rodney Blake (pseudonym), in the *Biblio*, Pompton Lakes, N. J., Vol. I, Oct. 21, pp. 77-79.

Aaron Grimstone, the money-king, was modeled after Hay's father-in-law, Amasa Stone.<sup>11</sup> Grimstone, like Stone, commits suicide in his bathroom—and for the same reason as Stone. In the first edition of *The Money-Makers* occurs the following passage:<sup>12</sup> "On the marble stand beside the bath the pamphlet edition of the finding of the jury in the Academy disaster was lying open at the page where Aaron Grimstone's name appeared as responsible for the lives lost." And in the New York *Herald* account of Stone's suicide occurs the following:<sup>13</sup> "The Ashtabula bridge which fell some time ago, causing the death of many persons, was one of his pet structures, and its loss caused him great worry. He had constant fear that he would be made legally responsible for the great loss of life occasioned by that disaster." There are other similarities—the most obvious one being the bluntness of both in conversation. And there is reason to believe—and this Mr. Clemens has not pointed out—that not only was Grimstone modeled after Stone, but Hilliard after John Hay himself. Like Hay, Archie Hilliard was secretary to a high official in Washington, and later a legate and editor. Like Hay's, his entrance into journalism was the result of an accident. In fact, the very year of his entrance into journalism was the same as that of Hay's.

Upon the appearance of *The Money-Makers* John Hay "hastened to New York by the fastest train available, saw the Appleton's, caused the first edition . . . to be suppressed, bought up every copy on sale in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, recalled hundreds of volumes from booksellers in other cities, and in every possible way placed *The Money-Makers* beyond the ken of the public eye." Later in the same year there appeared in the *Magazine of Western History*<sup>14</sup> a eulogistic article on Amasa Stone, signed J. H., in which Stone's suicide is attributed to insomnia and his bluntness (Keenan accounts for Grimstone's by the dehumanizing influence of his life) to his honesty. The suppression, so far at least as the present generation is concerned, seems to have been effective. Another edition was printed in 1886, but it seems not to have been noticed by the reviewers—a fact which, in view of Mr. Thayer's

<sup>11</sup> *How John Hay Suppressed a First Edition.*

<sup>12</sup> P. 336.

<sup>13</sup> May 11, 1883.

<sup>14</sup> Vol. 3, Dec., 1885, p. 108.



statement that the novel "achieved notoriety," is rather significant. The magazines had much to say about *The Breadwinners*; some of the reviewers mentioned it in spite of the fact that they didn't consider it very good, merely because it had created a sensation. They were more interested, apparently, in polemics defending capital than in those defending labor.

The question arises, of course, how far Grimstone and Hilliard are true representations of Stone and Hay—whether Stone was really such a hardened money-getter and Hay such a moral weakling as the novel would lead one to believe. Probably not, although certainly the book is not virulent or fanatical. In any case, *The Money-Makers* unquestionably deserves a place in any treatment of the American thesis novel. It belongs in the group of realistic studies, and ranks well among novels of its decade in characterization, style, plot, and development of thesis. The men and women in it are not personifications, but persons, and are treated with some degree of subtlety. The workers are not idealized; the money-getters are not wholly contemptible, and the worst of them are objects of pity rather than hatred. The immoral Beauxjambes is nevertheless capable of loving, and the intriguing Madame Domiguez is capable of gratitude. The parasite Hilliard is weak, but not vicious. Grimstone himself is to the last an affectionate father, and in his worst characteristics is the helpless victim of his own past. He is an excellent character, almost worthy of comparison to Dryfoos in Howells' *A Hazard of New Fortunes*.<sup>15</sup>

*The Money-Makers* has, it is true, its defects. For one thing, its treatment of the working class is superficial; Keenan did not understand them as well as Upton Sinclair. But if his knowledge was inadequate, he at least had the good sense to display it only when necessary. His novel is, for the most part, a study of the effects of the money philosophy upon the upper stratum. In this, and also in its treatment of journalism, it may be compared again to *A Hazard of New Fortunes*. It has a plot which is a thing in itself, and not merely a thread upon which to hang criticism and theories. And withal, the plot does not obscure the thesis; the two

<sup>15</sup> Harper, New York, 1891. Silas Lapham, of course, is not quite the same type.

are very closely correlated, and developed to a strong climax. Keenan, moreover, like Howells, although he did include some Democratic propaganda, had the wisdom to leave his problem unsolved. One the whole, *The Money-Makers* is probably the best novel of its particular type up to 1891; in some respects it is even superior to *A Hazard of New Fortunes*—it is not so long-winded, and much more virile. It is, as American novels of the eighties go, an artistic novel; and as a social study it is slightly more convincing than a text-book in sociology.

CLIFFORD A. BENDER.

*University of Minnesota.*

#### MILTON'S POPULARITY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

In view of the statement "Few read Milton now, unless under academic compulsion,"<sup>1</sup> it is interesting to recall the following passage from Carl Philip Moritz' *Reisen eines Deutschen in England im Jahr 1782*:<sup>2</sup>

Die Englischen Nationalschriften lieszt das Volk, wie unter anderen die unzähligen Auflagen beweisen. Meine Wirthinn, die nur eine Schneiderwittwe ist, lieszt ihren Milton, und erzählt mir, dasz ihr verstorbner Mann, sie eben wegen der guten Deklamation, womit sie den Milton las, zuerst liebgewonnen habe. Dieser einzelne Fall würde nichts beweisen, allein ich habe schon mehrere Leute von geringerm Stande gesprochen, die all ihre Nationalschriftsteller kannten und theils gelesen hatten.

ALFRED E. RICHARDS.

*University of New Hampshire.*

<sup>1</sup> Osgood, *New York Evening Post* (Literary Supplement), June 16, 1923, p. 764.

<sup>2</sup> *Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, No. 126, Dritte Folge, No. 6.

## TWO NOTES ON SPENSER'S CLASSICAL SOURCES

## I. SPENSER AND APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

In a previous article I have called attention to the influence of Apollonius Rhodius on Spenser's conception of the goddess of nature in *Mutabilitie*.<sup>1</sup> In the *Argonautica* is another passage which appears to be the source of one of the most brilliant passages in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*. The matter is more significant than the ordinary case of literary relationship, because it has to do with Spenser's recognition of the great importance of sea-power to the development of the greater Britain, and his sympathy with Raleigh's ambition to be instrumental in the carrying out of the imperial policy.

After the conversation between Colin and the "straunge shepheard" that day by Mulla's shore, and the contest in which Colin sings of the loves of Bregog and Mulla and the Shepherd of the Ocean sings of Cynthia, the Lady of the Sea, the two friends go to the ship that is to carry them across the perilous seas to find that shepherdess. Colin is appalled by the vastness of the realm in which nought but sea and heaven appeared. He asks the Shepherd of the Ocean to tell him under what sky or in what world they are, in which appear to be no living people. This realm, his friend tells him, is

The regiment  
Of a great shepheardesse, that Cynthia hight,  
His liege, his ladie, and his lifes regent.  
"If then," quoth I, "a shepheardesse she bee,  
Where be the flockes and heards, which she doth keep?  
And where may I the hills and pastures see,  
On which she useth for to feed her sheepe?"  
"These be the hills," quoth he, "the surges hie,  
On which faire Cynthia her heards doth feed:  
Her heards be thousand fishes, with their frie,  
Which in the bosome of the billowes breed."

When the shepherd summons them, he continues, "they all for their relief Wend too and fro at evening and at morn"; Proteus drives his herd of seals, compelling them which way he list:

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Philology*, xx, 234.

"And I among the rest, of many least,  
Have in the ocean charge to me assignd:  
Where I will live or die at her behest."

The figure is carried still further by the statement that a hundred nymphs of heavenly race have charge of the washing of Cynthia's sheep. So all these are

"the shepherds which my Cynthia serve  
At sea, beside a thousand moe at land:  
For land and sea my Cynthia doth deserve  
To have at her commandement at hand."

This passage is a free rendering of *Argon.* i, 570 ff. in which we are told that when the expedition set sail Orpheus sang:

Of Artemis, saviour of ships, child of a glorious sire, who hath in her keeping those peaks by the sea . . . and the fishes came darting through the deep sea, great mixed with small, and followed gambolling along the watery paths. And as when in the track of a shepherd their master, countless sheep follow to the fold that have fed to the full of grass, and he goes before gaily piping a shepherd's strain on his shrill reed, so these fishes followed, and a chasing breeze ever bore the ship onward.<sup>2</sup>

It will be noted that Artemis is identified by Spenser with Cynthia (Elizabeth), and that the comparison between the ship followed by fishes and the shepherd with his sheep suggests not only Elizabeth's dominion over the sea but the poet's happy epithet for Raleigh as "the Shepherd of the Ocean." To this we may now add what may have been dimly present in the poet's consciousness, that this journey of Raleigh and Spenser was a new expedition of the Argonauts. In the mind of one were the great plans for making England a maritime power; in the mind of the other the conception, partially worked out in the manuscript which he bore with him, of the poem which was to celebrate this new imperial Britain.

## II. SPENSER AND HESIOD

That Spenser was acquainted with Hesiod has been shown by a number of references cited since the time of Upton. The most important of the debts, however, seems to have escaped notice. The debate between Braggadocchio and Belpheobe in *Faerie Queene* II, III, 38 ff. has some resemblances to the passage in *Comus* in

<sup>2</sup> Tr. Seaton, Loeb edn., *Apol. Rhod. Argon.*

which the Lady rebukes the enchanter, and belongs to a distinguished literary tradition. One stanza in Spenser's splendid version of it leads us directly to Hesiod. The stanza (41) is as follows:

In woods, in waves, in warres, she wonts to dwell,  
And wil be found with perill and with paine;  
Ne can the man that moulds in ydle cell  
Unto her happy mansion attaine:  
Before her gate high God did Sweate ordaine,  
And wakefull watches ever to abide;  
But easy is the way and passage plaine  
To pleasures pallace: it may soone be spide,  
And day and night her dores to all stand open wide.

This passage about the way to honor is imitated from *Works and Days* I, 287-292. A little later, Hesiod's version appealed to another Elizabethan poet, George Chapman, and in order to show the parallel I quote his translation:

With much ease  
To Vice and her love, men may make access;  
Such crews in rout herd to her, and her court  
So passing near lies, their way sweet and short;  
But before Virtue do the Gods rain sweat,  
Through which, with toil and half-dissolved feet,  
You must wade to her; her path long and steep,  
And at your entry 'tis so sharp and deep.  
But scaling once her height, the joy is more  
Than all the pain she put you to before.

Chapman's note on the passage emphasizes it as an expression of the conflict through which the soul fights through the knowledge and hate of the miseries and beastliness of vice:

His argument to persuade to virtue here is taken both from her own natural fate and the divine disposition of God; for as she hath a body, being supposed the virtue of man, and through the worthily exercised and instructed organs of that body, her soul receives her excitation to all her expressible knowledge (for *dati sunt sensus ad excitandum intellectum*), so to the love and habit of knowledge and virtue there is first necessarily required a laborious and painful conflict, fought through the knowledge and hate of the miseries and beastliness of vice. And this painful passage to Virtue Virgil imitated in his translation of the Pythagorean letter Y.

Chapman's note indicates precisely the exposition of the virtue

of Temperance which is the subject of Spenser's Legend of Guyon; the allegory of the soul and the body, and of the place of knowledge and of the intellectual love of God, of which Chapman speaks, are implicit throughout the book. As to the "Pythagorean letter Y," ascribed to Virgil in Spenser's and Chapman's time, we have Chapman's translation, as follows:

This letter of Pythagoras, that bears  
 This fork'd distinction, to conceit prefers  
 The form man's life bears. Virtue's hard way takes  
 Upon the right hand path, which entry makes  
 (To sensual eyes) with difficult affair;  
 But when ye once have climb'd the highest stair,  
 The beauty and the sweetness it contains,  
 Give rest and comfort, for past all your pains.  
 The broadway in a bravery paints ye forth,  
 (In th' entry) softness, and much shade of worth;  
 But when ye reach the top, the taken ones  
 It headlong hurls down, torn at sharpest stones.  
 He then, whom virtues love, shall victor crown  
 Of hardest fortunes, praise wins and renown;  
 But he that sloth and fruitless luxury  
 Pursues, and doth with foolish wariness fly  
 Opposed pains (that all best acts befall),  
 Lives poor and vile, and dies despised of all.<sup>3</sup>

EDWIN GREENLAW.

---

<sup>3</sup>I am indebted to Professor W. P. Mustard for a reference to Persius  
*Sat.* III:

et tibi quae Samios diduxit littera ramos  
 surgentem dextro monstravit limite callem.

Professor Gildersleeve's note on this passage explains that the letter Y, "or rather its old form Y, was selected by Pythagoras to embody the immemorial image of the two paths (Hesiod, *O. et D.*, 287-292), so familiar in the apologue of Hercules at the cross-roads (Xen., *Comm.*, 2, 1, 20), and alluded to again by our author, 5, 34. Hence this letter was called the Pythagorean; Auson., 12, *de litt. monos.*, 9." Gildersleeve also cites Conington's explanation of the symbolism of the letter: "The stem stands for the unconscious life of infancy and childhood, the diverging branches for the alternative offered to the youth, virtue or vice."



## A HANDFUL OF PLEASANT DELIGHTS

When my *Handful of Pleasant Delights* (1584) was published by the Harvard University Press in January, 1924, I devoted considerable space to arguing that the first Elizabethan edition was actually printed in 1566, the year in which it was registered at Stationers' Hall for publication. Since that time my arguments, which were generally approved, have received totally unexpected confirmation in the discovery of a fragment of what may have been the 1566 edition, and of what, in any case, was certainly an edition earlier than that of 1584.

This fragment (which is totally different from the other fragment of one leaf printed on pages 74-75 of my book) was sold at Sotheby and Company's, London, on July 27, 1925, for £160. It was bought by the Rosenbach Company, of New York and Philadelphia, from whose hands it passed into the Huntington Library. Through the kindness of Mr. Huntington's librarian, some time ago I was permitted to examine photographs of the fragment, which consists of four leaves corresponding exactly to signatures D2-D3, D6-D7, of the *Handful* of 1584 and to pages 51-54, 59-62, of my edition of 1924.

In the near future I hope to incorporate these leaves in a new edition of my book. Meanwhile, it is interesting to know that the *Handful* went through three Elizabethan editions—not one, as was believed for many years,—thus surpassing in popularity both the *Gorgeous Gallery* of 1578 and the *Phoenix Nest* of 1593, neither of which, so far as is known, reached a second edition.

HYDER E. ROLLINS.

New York University.

## A NOTE ON PEREGRINE PICKLE AND PYGMALION

Professor Tatlock wrote a letter, printed in *The Nation*, Feb. 18, 1915, pointing out the similarity between the plot of Shaw's *Pygmalion* and the incident of the "nymph of the road" in the eighty-seventh chapter of Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*. In this letter he suggested what has occurred to many readers of Shaw and

Smollett: that the modern playwright used the eighteenth century novelist as a source. The following brief summaries will show how naturally such an idea would occur to one familiar with both works.

*Peregrine Pickle*

Peregrine meets by chance with a buxom beggar-lass whose mother is only too glad to get rid of her for a small sum. The girl is sent ahead to the "garrison," under Pipes' custody, to be cleansed and re-clad. Peregrine is so much impressed by the "nymph's" altered appearance that he decides to hoax society by passing her off as a young lady of rank and breeding. He spends some days in schooling her in deportment and proper enunciation, teaches her quotations from Shakespeare, Otway, and Pope, as well as some operatic airs to be hummed during pauses in conversation, and above all, instructs her in whist, brag, and cribbage. After a preliminary introduction to provincial society, in which his protégée fairly dazzles the squires, he takes her to London, where he continues her education in French and dancing, and squires her to plays and concerts. When all is ready, he conducts her to a public assembly, dances with her to the admiration of all present, and succeeds in introducing her to various ladies of quality. Thus his trick has triumphed. At a subsequent card-party, however, the girl grows furious at discovering a certain lady in the act of cheating: wrath strips off the thin veneer of culture, and she horrifies the company by her language and attitudes. Immediately afterwards, she elopes with Peregrine's Swiss valet, and the hero, though at first angry, relents to the extent of assisting the couple to set up a coffee-house which proves financially successful.

*Pygmalion*

Henry Higgins, a professional phonetician, wagers with his friend Colonel Pickering that he can transform Eliza Doolittle, a chance-met and much bedraggled Covent Garden flower-girl, into a young lady presentable in the best society. The test is to be her appearance at a garden-party six months later. In Eliza's transformation the emphasis is laid on the processes of cleansing and re-clothing; her education in deportment and enunciation is singularly suggestive of that of Peregrine's "nymph"; like that young person she is bought from her father, taken to the opera, given a preliminary introduction to society at a tea in Mrs. Higgins' apartment, and scores a triumph at the garden party. Although the hoax on society is not discovered immediately afterwards, the play ends when Eliza leaves Higgins and Pickering, and Mr. Shaw explains in an epilogue that she marries Freddy Hill, a rather useless young chap, and with the assistance of her friends, sets up a flower shop in which she and her husband find their true vocation.

There are, of course, differences between the play and the episode. Alfred Doolittle, for instance, has, as Eliza's father, far greater

prominence in the play than the beggar-woman had in the novel; Freddy Hill and Peregrine's Swiss valet, who play corresponding rôles, differ at least in social rank; and Smollett had no persons analogous to Colonel Pickering and Mrs. Higgins. Nevertheless, as Professor Tatlock has pointed out, the underlying satiric purpose of both authors was the same, and the correspondence among minor and major incidents is exceedingly close. In novel, as in play:

- 1) The meetings between the girls and the men who transform them are pure chance;
- 2) the girls are purchased for small sums from their parents;
- 3) the processes of cleansing and re-clothing are amusingly emphasized, as well as the girls' reaction to these processes;
- 4) The methods of social education are nearly identical;
- 5) There are preliminary introductions to selected groups;
- 6) The débuts in society are triumphant;
- 7) The girls leave their benefactors to marry persons of much less importance in the story;
- 8) The young couples, assisted by the respective "Pygmaliions," set up successfully in shop-keeping.

It would be hard to find, from internal evidence, a clearer case of borrowing. It would likewise be hard to find a case in which borrowing was more justified by the results. Plagiarism, in any evil sense of the word, could be charged to Mr. Shaw as little as to Shakespeare, who apparently did precisely the same sort of thing. Since Mr. Shaw, however, has the advantage of being very much alive, the present writer had the temerity to send a note of inquiry regarding this strange similarity. The reply may be taken as a warning against too hasty acceptance of internal evidence as to sources. It speaks for itself:

10 Adelphi Terrace, W. C. 2  
27th May, 1925

Dear Sir,

Mr. Bernard Shaw desires me to say that his attention has been called repeatedly to *Peregrine Pickle* since *Pygmalion* appeared. This is interesting as shewing that people still read Smollett. He never read *P. P.*: Humphrey Clinker was his sole boyish excursion into Smollett. This is lucky as otherwise his play might have been prevented or aborted. The experiment of two writers of fiction treating the same subject and pro-

ducing the same series of incidents—the same result practically—shews that the human imagination always runs in the same grooves, and that this is the explanation of almost all the alleged plagiarisms.

Yours faithfully,

BLANCHE PATCH,  
Secretary.

Yale University.

E. S. NOYES.

#### THE ANATOMIST DISSECTED—BY LEMUEL GULLIVER

The vogue of "Gulliver" as a nom-de-plume, which followed closely upon the publication by Swift of his famous *Travels*, concerned itself chiefly with imitations of the satire of "Lilliput." The attack upon pedantry in "Laputa," however, gave birth to a very curious tract in ridicule of the researches of the Royal Society. The full title is as follows:

*The Anatomist Dissected; or the man-midwife finely brought to bed. Being an examination of the conduct of Mr. St. André touching the late pretended rabbit-bearer. By Lemuel Gulliver. Surgeon and anatomist to the kings of Lilliput and Balnibarbi, and fellow of the Academy of Sciences in Blefuscu. London, 1727.*

The allusion is to the claim of one Mary Tofts to have given birth to eighteen rabbits at one confinement. Contemporaries differ as to the number of rabbits born. No less than a half a dozen tracts on the controversy are mentioned by the pamphleteers. Incidentally, the affair of Mary Tofts gives us the certain explanation of the obscure passage at the close of Mrs. Howard's letter to Swift, November 17, 1726, the interpretation of which has hitherto escaped the commentators. The passage referred to is as follows:

I cannot conclude without telling you, that our island is in great joy; one of our Yahoos . . . has brought forth four perfect black rabbits. May we not hope . . . that in time our female Yahoos will produce a race of Houyhnhnms?

In *The Anatomist Dissected* the satire is ostensibly directed at Mr. St. André, the attending physician who attested the confinement; but in reality, the victims of ridicule are the fellows of the Royal Society. In the Introduction, "Gulliver" describes the prevailing excitement among the scientists, their feverish efforts to

refute the miracle and to rescue the laws of biology from chaos. In the body of the tract he imitates and of course distorts their pompous diction and learned arguments. The thesis is of no interest to us now; but the manner, which is typically Gulliverian and uniquely Laputan, entitles the pamphlet to a place along with the better-known apocrypha of *Gulliver's Travels*.

After entertaining the public with my Travels (he begins) I little thought any private occurrence in so small a spot as the island of Great Britain could have roused my attention and broke in upon that repose in which I hoped to spend the remains of a declining life. But small and inconsiderable as it is, I consider that it is my own country. . . My inextinguishable thirst after truth, and an ardent inclination of communicating it to others have prevailed upon me once more to be exposed in print in order to express my abhorrence of a late diabolical imposture, namely the rabbit affair, which has been the real and only cause why the perusal of my Travels has been so neglected of late, which by the decay of the sale has sensibly affected a worthy and honest bookseller. . . My motive for entering the lists is my skill in surgery and the great ignorance which Mr. St. André has betrayed on this occasion. . .

With characteristic flippancy, Gulliver proceeds to ridicule the whole affair, and St. André in particular for failing to "smell a rat instead of a rabbit":

In the kingdom of Balnibarbi, this virtuoso (St. André) would have been adopted into the Academy of Sciences. Nay, it is ten to one but he would be taken up into the flying island and appointed anatomist extraordinary to the court of Laputa.

The tract is marked by its derision of the methods of research, but this after all is superficial and negligible. For us it is interesting chiefly as another page in the hitherto unbound volume of writings produced under the direct influence of *Gulliver's Travels*.<sup>1</sup>

American University, Cairo, Egypt.

WILLIAM A. EDDY.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the bibliography and discussion of the entire corpus of *Gulliveriana*, see the writer's "*Gulliver's Travels—A Critical Study*." (Princeton University Press.)

## REVIEWS.

---

*Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration*, by J. W. KRUTCH.  
New York, Columbia University Press, 1924.

The drama of the Restoration and the early eighteenth century has of late years attracted considerable scholarly attention: Messrs. Bernbaum, Nicoll and Dobrée have published fair-sized volumes; besides these, there is more than one doctorate dissertation in manuscript; and a full list of articles and notes on the Collier controversy and other pertinent subjects would make a very respectable bibliography. Dr. Krutch's volume can, therefore, hardly be said to open a new field, and one is at once struck by the paucity of reference to those who have preceded him, and by the lack of any bibliography of recent works on his subject; but, in spite of this, his book is a valuable summary of the relations of English comedy to the actual social conditions that the plays portrayed and to the rising dramatic criticism of the period.

Dr. Krutch explains Restoration comedy as pure contemporary realism, its immorality as the reflection of the indecency in current fashionable conversation and of the unfeeling egotism and cynicism in contemporary manners and philosophy. These social conditions, as the author shows, obtained almost solely among the nobility, and the drama that reflected them was supported by the two social extremes; the middle class read Baxter and Bunyan, and eschewed stage plays. Restoration comedy as a literary tradition continued after the Revolution of 1688; but, even several years before Collier published his *Short View*, the rise of the middle class under William and Mary and the improved example of the Court were reacting on society in general and to some degree even on the drama: "Books and the theater became less and less the affair only of the aristocracy; and the middle class, which was not only more regular in life but also less capable of regarding literature with moral detachment, made its influence felt."<sup>1</sup> The main thesis, therefore, of more than half of the book would seem to be somewhat as follows: just as Restoration comedy represented actual conditions and the cynical perversity of the Court of Charles II; so sentimental comedy represented, if not actual conditions, at least the sentimental perversity of the bourgeois classes who in the 1690's assumed an important place as literary patrons; and the truth of this attitude, which is borne out by extensive data collected

<sup>1</sup> Krutch, 153. See also the following pages, especially on the Societies for the Reformation of Manners.



in the volume, is further attested by such documents as Heywood's *Woman Killed With Kindness* in which sentimentalism as a bourgeois tendency appears even in late Elizabethan drama before Puritanism had quite withdrawn the middle classes from the theater.

Strangely enough, however, after an interesting survey of dramatic criticism and the beginnings of dramatic reviewing, Dr. Krutch seems definitely to repudiate this thesis: "... Sentimental Comedy," he says, "was not a spontaneous expression but a machine-made product constructed in accordance with definite rules";<sup>2</sup> sentimental philosophy was apparently not especially characteristic of the early eighteenth century bourgeois; in the change from Restoration comedy to sentimental comedy the only significance of the rise of the middle classes is negative—they objected to the profane and the obscene—and the fact that sentimentalism rather than some other philosophic and artistic point of view replaced the old attitude, Dr. Krutch attributes to the rise of dramatic criticism about the year 1700. Of course, literary criticism was an influence; but surely Dennis and even Collier<sup>3</sup> himself were as much opposed to sentimental drama as was Steele in favor of it; criticism, therefore, was divided; and, furthermore, if literary criticism is to be looked upon as determining the rise of sentimental drama, one should surely find at least one early critical document of a clearly sentimental trend to account for the spectacular success of Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* in 1696. Apparently, no such document exists. Dramatic criticism played an undoubted part in the movement; but one feels that Dr. Krutch has allowed the subject-matter of his later chapters too much weight in his conclusions.

The prose in which the book is written is on the whole not only clear but readable. Occasional neat phrases stand out almost like epigrams: "... the sophisticated yet uncynical advocacy of virtue which made the triumph of the *Spectator*,"<sup>4</sup> for example. The discussion of Mrs. Centlivre's *Artifice* is not without an ironic appositiveness:

Face to face with a cast-off mistress, the hero offers her a one-third share in his affections, and she refuses. Then with that strange susceptibility to conversion which began to manifest itself in rakes about the year 1700, he is about to turn honorable when she tells him that, anticipating no such conclusion, she has just given him poison. The fear of matrimony is allayed by the prospect of death, and he agrees to atone for

<sup>2</sup> Krutch, 249. See also 257.

<sup>3</sup> See his attack on Cibber in the *Short View*.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Krutch admits this to be the first Sentimental Comedy, p. 202.

<sup>5</sup> Krutch, 213.

past sins by marrying her. Of course the draught turns out not to be fatal and the couple are left to live happily ever after, or at least as happily as the reader can imagine them to have.\*

JOHN W. DRAPER.

*University of Maine.*

---

*A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, by ERNEST WEEKLEY. New York, E. P. Dutton & Company, 1924.

Since the history of words wins a popular interest not accorded to any other branch of linguistic science, Professor Ernest Weekley's *Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* is a welcome addition to our handy reference books. The work is an abridgment of the author's *Etymological Dictionary* published in 1921, having been made concise by the omission of quotation and comment rather than by a reduction in the number of entries. It includes a brief account of the tradition of English speech (not found in the earlier work), select bibliographies of word-books, a glossary of technical linguistic terms, and brief etymologies of more than 35,000 words. Like all British word-books, this dictionary fails to fit the American vocabulary precisely. One finds such recent terms as *Cheka*, *poilu*, *blimp*, *pogo*, but not *cater-cornered*, *jerkwater*, *cafeteria*, *jitney*; and it is surprising to find the *jimmy* of the American burglar listed as a *james* or a *jemmy*. The soldier slang of a decade ago, now happily in the way to obsolescence, is well represented. Though the loss of the citations of the larger work is unfortunate, there is a gain in convenience of reference, and the book is readable and useful.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*La Jeunesse d'Anatole France, 1844-1876*, par GEORGES GIRARD. Nouvelle Revue Française, 1925. 233 pages.

*Dernières Pages Inédites d'Anatole France*, par MICHEL CORDAY. Calmann-Lévy, 1925. 197 pages.

These two books make a valuable addition to the works of Anatole France in that, by making public his earliest writings and those that were unpublished at the time of his death, they give us a complete idea of his literary development from the very beginning to the end of his career.

\* Krutch, 221.

The charming and profusely illustrated study of M. Girard begins with the *Nouvelles Pensées et Maximes Chrétiennes par Anatole, 1852, prix 50 centimes*. At the age of seven he feels his vocation as an author sufficiently to draw up a title-page and fix the price of his work. A little later he composes a *Choix de Maximes, parva sed dilecta*, according to the inscription on the cover. His school-boy diary shows dislike of school, but, in spite of this, some of his literary compositions were notable and are still precious preserved in the archives of the Collège Stanilas: the *Légende de Guttenberg, 1859*; *Légende de Sainte-Radégonde*, his first printed work, and *Légende de la Récluse, 1860*; *Le goût des Jardins* and *Méditation sur les Ruines de Palmyre, 1861*. His interest in the historical and legendary is already keen and is further evidenced by his letters from Normandy in 1859 and 1861. On the last page of the *Légende de Guttenberg*, he drew a plan which showed a line leading from his father's shop to the Academy. One is reminded of the youthful Hugo and his, "Je veux être Chateaubriand ou rien." His articles in the *Amateur d'autographes* from 1867 on show his love for Greek and Latin antiquity, the sixteenth century, and Rabelais, Rénier and Molière in the classic period, and the pagan charm of the eighteenth. One finds in them ideas, personages, and whole passages which appear in later works. The thirty-eight rather mediocre love-poems show the influence of Gautier, Leconte de Lisle and, especially, Hugo. The play, *Sir Punch*, is a combination of the Falstaff and Don Juan ideas. His letters during the Commune relate his escape from Paris and exile at Versailles. In 1873, the *Poèmes dorés* win him universal recognition.

At the close of his long career, he left a number of unfinished manuscripts, which are examined by Monsieur Corday in his book. Part of them are a series of dialogues, intended to be published under the title *Sous la rose*. In the *Dialogue sur l'existence de Dieu et la métaphysique*, he rallies man's pretention to find anything other than himself in his metaphysics or his concept of God. In the *Dialogue sur la vieillesse*, he deplores the weakness of old age and finds caution rather than wisdom in old men. In the *Dialogue sur l'avenir*, he foresees the disappearance of the human race from the globe, which, in its turn, will be destroyed. In the *Dialogue sur la pudeur*, he finds Christianity, due to its disdain of the flesh, has exaggerated pudor to a distasteful extent. In the *Entretien sur la guerre*, which dates from the war itself, he assumes the position of the socialists and hopes they will realize the United States of the World. Anatole France's indignation at the useless prolongation of the war is shown in the well-known "lettre a R. . ." which Monsieur Corday has reproduced and which Anatole France intended to insert in this dialogue. The

*Entretien sur l'astronomie* takes us through space, where worlds are born and die as our own must die. He wonders again if life on the globe is not due to mold or decomposition.

In addition to these dialogues, Anatole France left several "projets." Toward the end of 1919, he planned a novel to be called "*le Cyclope*, une satire tragique et bouffonne de l'humanité, du genre de la *Révolte des Anges* et *l'Île des Pingouins*." Twenty centuries after Napoleon, the race of cyclops has re-appeared and, no progress having been realized in their absence, wages war as in the days of old. He told the reporters who interviewed him when he received the Nobel prize that he intended to write a book against war. "Ce livre, je veux le faire tel qu'il offense le moins possible de gens, le moins possible de maréchaux et même de caporaux." He also planned a novel on Napoleon. The latter lands from Elba and lodges for the night at the house of one of his partisans whose daughter has just fallen ill with the measles. One may imagine what the irony of Anatole France would have done with this situation and how vastly more important the illness of the little girl would have seemed to the parents than the emperor and his world-shaking business. Besides these works, he had also planned a novel having the mild Firmin Piedagnel of *l'Orme du mail* as its hero, a continuation of *la Révolte des Anges* and a novel entitled *Monsieur Gaulard*, another ironical portrait to add to those of professors in *Pierre Nozière*, *le Petit Pierre*, and *la Vie en fleur*.

J. K. DITCHY.

University of Minnesota.

---

*L'Algérie dans la Littérature Française.* Par CHARLES TAILLIART, Vice-Recteur de l'Académie d'Alger. Paris, Champion, 1925. vi, 676 pp.—*Essai de Bibliographie Méthodique et Raisonnée.* Paris, Champion, 1925. vi, 466 pp.

L'auteur de ces deux gros volumes a élevé un véritable monument d'érudition patiente, probe et éclairée à une "province" française qu'il aime, qu'il connaît et qu'il a parcourue, en observateur attentif, épris des paysages et de toutes les manifestations de la vie, pendant plus d'un quart de siècle. Il a été un des témoins de ce choc des races qui se prolongera encore sans doute longtemps dans l'Afrique du Nord et par toute son attitude montre bien qu'il est un de ceux qui peuvent aider à rendre moins dangereux les conflits qui peuvent encore se produire. La première partie de ce travail, destinée à établir les différentes étapes qu'a parcouru l'opinion publique française à l'égard de l'Algérie pendant près d'un siècle ne nous appartient pas. Elle était cependant loin

d'être inutile. Après avoir rapidement repris les indications déjà données par M. Martino dans son livre sur *L'Orient dans la Littérature Française*, M. Tailliar arrive à cette conclusion que "de tout cela les Français de 1830 ne connaissaient à peu près rien. L'ignorance, à cette date, des choses et des gens de la Régénée d'Alger était à peu près absolue" (p. 45). Les trois premiers chapitres montrent comment, graduellement, l'intérêt pour la nouvelle colonie s'est accru et contiennent des pages pénétrantes sur la psychologie des conquérants dont les portraits sont vigoureusement brossés. Avec le chapitre IV, nous arrivons à *L'Algérie dans les ouvrages purement descriptifs* (p. 322). M. Tailliar a remis dans son cadre Fromentin pour qui il a un faible marqué; c'est au tout premier rang qu'il le place parmi ses contemporains et même ses successeurs Guillaumet, Masqueray, Louis Bertrand et Isabelle Eberhardt. Malgré les nombreux récits qui avaient été écrits avant *Un été dans le Sahara* et *Un été dans le Sahel*, Fromentin n'en a pas moins fait pour le paysage africain ce que Chateaubriand avait fait pour le paysage américain: il en a révélé la beauté et les couleurs à ses compatriotes et son influence se prolonge nettement jusqu'à nos jours. Par contre, l'Algérie n'a guère inspiré les poètes. Parmi les vers que cite M. Tailliar, les meilleurs semblent être ceux de Jules Lemaître que M. Martino avait déjà signalés. Encore faut-il remarquer que Lemaître ne connaît guère qu'Alger et que la lumière cruelle du Sud blesse de façon douloureuse ses yeux de Beauceron accoutumés à des paysages modérés.

La liste des romans sur l'Algérie est beaucoup plus longue et beaucoup plus riche, et la nouvelle colonie fournit déjà de nombreux sujets de romans, d'ailleurs assez médiocres, peu d'années après la conquête. M. Tailliar signale le fait que Balzac avait l'intention d'écrire des romans algériens, il aurait pu indiquer que, dans *la Cousine Bette*, l'épisode du vieux Fisher pourrait déjà être considéré comme une esquisse de l'un de ces romans. De cette masse de plus de 200 volumes, où l'auteur à juste raison a fait une place aux romans populaires, quelques œuvres de tout premier ordre se dégagent: plusieurs romans de Louis Bertrand qui ont des chances d'être de vrais chefs-d'œuvres, un roman de Robert Randau et des pages, sinon des ouvrages entiers d'Isabelle Eberhardt. Quant au théâtre, il vaut autant n'en point parler.

Cette littérature a un aspect particulier sur lequel M. Tailliar attire l'attention: tout d'abord on y rencontre peu d'indigènes, et souvent ceux que l'on y rencontre paraissent peu vraisemblables et bien superficiellement observés. C'est qu'au total nous sommes en pays musulman et en pays oriental et que la vie de famille reste cachée par le mur de la tente ou le mur d'argile aux yeux européens. Il est d'ailleurs fort remarquable, et tout à l'éloge de M. Tailliar, que malgré sa longue expérience du pays, il ne prétend



pas être arrivé à une connaissance plus intime de ce mystère de l'âme étrangère que ne l'ont fait les auteurs qu'il analyse. Les seules femmes qu'ont pu connaître Fromentin, Feydeau, les Goncourt, Gautier, ne sont que les spécialistes des danses orientales; pour les autres, même, chose piquante, pour Isabelle Eberhardt, "les créations de l'esprit se sont substituées à la réalité" (p. 582). On me permettra ici, d'exprimer un regret en passant, c'est que M. Tailliar n'ait point quelque part dans son ouvrage ramassé les indications qu'il donne en des chapitres séparés pour montrer comment "ces créations de l'esprit" avaient pris naissance et comment certains types, d'ailleurs faux, avaient fini par s'imposer. On hésite, devant un travail d'une telle dimension, à indiquer que certains aspects du sujet auraient pu être étudiés plus complètement. Tout en reconnaissant avec M. Tailliar que le catholicisme n'a pu s'étendre et gagner dans un pays primitivement musulman et chez des indigènes qui sont encouragés à se développer dans le sens de leur religion, on s'étonnera un peu que le nom du Cardinal Lavigerie n'ait été mentionné qu'une fois et en note (p. 298). De plus, au moins pour les vingt ou trente dernières années, je crois qu'il y aurait eu avantage, au moins en ce qui concerne les chapitres sur la littérature proprement dite, à étendre cette enquête à toute l'Afrique du Nord. Deux des ouvrages les plus importants de Charles Géniaux, *Notre petit gourbi*, et surtout *Le choc des races* sont ainsi omis, sans doute parce que tunisiens. J'aurais aimé à savoir si Mme de Lens dans *Le Harem entr'ouvert* et dans *L'Etrange aventure d'Aguida* n'a pas un peu mieux pénétré que tant d'autres le mystère de l'âme orientale. Il semble bien que le roman marocain de Nolly qui a pour titre *Le Conquérant* traite du même sujet et décrive les mêmes types que *La Cina*, et *Pepete le Bien-Aimé* de Louis Bertrand ou que l'ouvrage de Géniaux dont nous venons de parler. M. Tailliar indique d'ailleurs lui-même (p. 491) que les jeunes écrivains de la Tunisie, de l'Algérie et du Maroc essaient depuis quelques années de se grouper pour créer une littérature nord-africaine, ce qui indique à tout le moins une volonté commune, des aspirations communes et un désir d'unification qu'on ne peut négliger. Je m'empresse d'ailleurs d'ajouter qu'il s'agit ici d'un regret plus que d'une critique; M. Tailliar ayant délimité son sujet a voulu ne parler que de ce dont il était certain, que des pays qu'il avait vus et que de la vie avec laquelle il a eu pendant si longtemps un contact direct. A cet ouvrage si riche et si documenté est jointe une bibliographie systématique qui ne comprend pas moins de 3177 articles. On y trouvera autre chose qu'une simple énumération: dans la plupart des cas, l'auteur a donné en de courtes analyses la substance des articles qu'il cite et au moins un sommaire des livres mentionnés. C'est un instrument



de travail indispensable pour qui veut écrire sur l'Algérie ou étudier à nouveau un des aspects les plus attrayants de l'exotisme contemporain.

GILBERT CHINARD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Dictionnaire de la Langue Française du Seizieme Siècle.* Par EDMOND HUGUET. Fascicules 1, 2. Paris: Champion, 1925. lxxvi + 80 pp.

The two fascicules that have appeared contain the preface, which is full of linguistic information, and the word list up to the word *advenement*. In form the book will resemble the *Dictionnaire général* and be about twice its size. The author proposes to include only words and locutions found in the sixteenth century and no longer in use, words then employed with different meanings from those they have today, and words which have survived with the same meanings but for which he has found an earlier first date than that given in the *Dictionnaire général*. He also points out changes in pronunciation (*Jérusalem*), syllabification (*paon*, *poète*), morphology (*canals*, *resolvis*), and syntax (genders, transitives that are now intransitives). The work is based chiefly on the study of some three or four hundred texts of which the list is given. Where so much labor has been expended, one hesitates to suggest further investigation, but it seems to me that the *rhétoriciens*, who must be a fruitful field for words, have been somewhat neglected and that the work of men like Malherbe and d'Urfé that was published in the sixteenth century ought to be included, even though, as M. H. says, they belong in the main to the seventeenth. On the other hand, he is altogether justified in including d'Aubigné, Brantôme, Regnier, sixteenth century men whose work was printed after the century closed. I am sorry, however, he did not carry the investigation further and study not only Dumas's *Lydie* (1609), but Hardy and other writers of the early seventeenth century, whose work would reward linguistic investigation. M. H. usually consults editions published during the author's lifetime, or modern critical editions, but occasionally, as in the case of Rabelais and Ronsard, where he clings to Marty-Laveaux, he fails to employ the most reliable editions. Such defects are, however, of small consequence. If the method outlined in the preface and applied in the first 80 pages is carried out with the same diligence and acumen that have been displayed thus far, the work, except for its chronological limitations, will rank with Godefroy,

Littre and Tobler. It will be one of the chief contributions made in this century to French studies, one that no university can afford to do without.

H. C. LANCASTER.

---

*Liber de Miraculis Sanctae Dei Genitricis Marie.* Published at Vienna in 1731 by Bernard Pez. Reprinted by T. F. Crane. New York: Oxford University Press, 1925.

This collection of forty-four miracles of the Virgin, written in Latin, was first published by Pez from a Heiligenkreuz manuscript in 1731. The book, suppressed immediately because of certain details in it offensive to the imperial Austrian chancellor and to the prefect of the imperial court library at Vienna, became so rare that only a few examples are known to have survived. Professor Crane was fortunate enough to have at his disposition the Harvard University copy, and we are even more fortunate, not only in having the work at last made available, but in the editor who has performed that task.

Between 1887 and 1898 Adolfo Mussafia in a series of five articles in the *Sitzungsberichte* of Vienna attempted to trace the origins and relationships of the many collections of Miracles of the Virgin that have come down to us. His work is of course invaluable, but the fact that so much of it is based upon Pez's collection has hitherto created difficulties for the many students to whom that collection was inaccessible. Professor Crane has now printed the full text of Pez and has added his own bibliographical notes on each of the forty-four stories (pp. 82-107) together with a convenient table of comparisons (pp. 118-9) indicating where the same tales are to be found in the other great collections of Miracles of the Virgin. He has also reduced to order and clarity Mussafia's necessarily scattered and occasionally obscure references to Pez, and notwithstanding the brevity of his Introduction he has paused long enough in several instances (cf. p. xx) to suggest alluring by-paths for others to investigate. Needless to say, all students of the subject will find the volume indispensable.

The book, however, is something more than the work of an exceedingly competent scholar. It appeared soon after the author's eightieth birthday and it includes a Bibliography of his writings from 1868 to 1924 that contains some 331 titles exclusive of the present work. Professor Crane in his Preface (p. x) expresses the hope that his record may be of encouragement to younger scholars and "show that in spite of the administrative duties which

claim, perhaps unfortunately, so much time from American college teachers, it is possible to continue productive work." Such a record will indeed encourage younger scholars, especially when they discover that these books, papers, and reviews cover an amazingly wide range of subjects and reveal an author who is at once a specialist and a humanist. And if such an example prove an incentive to the younger generation, this volume itself will be stimulating to those not so young, for only older scholars can fully appreciate what it means to print an exhaustive and authoritative piece of research at the age of four score years.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

---

*The Fable of the Bees.* By BERNARD MANDEVILLE. Edited, with a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory, by F. B. Kaye. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press, 1924. Two volumes, pp. cxlvi, 412; 481.

Mandeville's *Fable* is surprisingly timely. Its discussions of luxury, morals, trade, and the search for happiness read like commentaries on present day matters. Its famous paradox is not inapplicable to modern life. Most of all, perhaps, Mandeville's penetrating analysis of sentimentalized morality appeals to the observer of contemporary American life. Even the essay on Charity Schools has present value in what is said about colleges and learning, and the remarks on the place of Latin and on special occupational training represent one section of current educational theory. The style is astonishingly modern. Whole passages in Part I, capitalization and punctuation altered, might appear in one of our sprightly journals of opinion without seeming out of key. The dialogues in Part II are less easily converted, but they are lively reading. We hear much of social psychology in these days; here is social psychology written in a former age, but if it is not for all time, it is fitted, in many ways, to this present.

For making it a delight to read this old book modern readers are deeply indebted to Professor Kaye and to his publishers. The two volumes are splendid examples of modern printing. No expense has been spared: the reproduction of the ornaments of James Roberts, the master printer who created the format of the original Part II; the special types for the prefaces and the type used in the text itself; the careful study of the title pages for this new edition and the reproductions of title pages of all the older editions—these elements add distinction to the book. Merely to have given us a sumptuous edition of the text would have been high service; Professor Kaye has done much more. His text is carefully edited,

with full critical apparatus. He has supplied, in his notes, a learned commentary. In an appendix he gives extracts from critical essays. There is a chronological list of references to Mandeville, with brief notes, so that we have in compact form a complete history of the book and of its reputation. The canon of the works is determined. There is an extremely valuable index to the commentary, which will be consulted by many students not primarily interested in the *Fable*. The detailed introduction is a book in itself, the most considerable account of Mandeville's system of thought. In printing, in text, and in scholarly apparatus this edition is a contribution of the first rank.

Professor Kaye's purpose, he tells us, is to orient Mandeville in the stream of thought. While he gives much valuable information, in his notes, concerning sources, his object has been rather to supply the proper background for understanding Mandeville's relation to the history of thought than to spend undue time upon source-hunting. He disposes of the legends about Mandeville's life; important documents are reproduced; the biography is as complete as can be expected in view of the paucity of records after 1703 and the lack of first-hand evidence as to the author's character and habits except what he himself has told us.

The interpretation of Mandeville's thought is based not on the paradox or on the relation to Shaftesbury, common ground for criticism, but upon its essential empiricism. Paradox and contradiction are implicit in the thought of the time, and Professor Kaye gives an excellent summary of the conflicting currents. The essential paradox of the *Fable* is not in the idea that evil has a good side but in the definition of virtue. Mandeville adopted both the ascetic ideal and the ideal of conduct according to the dictates of reason. Virtue is defined as the result of acts by which man, "contrary to the impulse of nature should endeavour the benefit of others or the conquest of his own passions out of a rational ambition of being good." To this blend of asceticism and rationalism, from which emotion is excluded, Mr. Kaye gives the name "rigorism." The word is in Mandeville, though not quite in Mr. Kaye's sense, which is Kantian. Mandeville's pessimism is due to the fact that when he examined the world in the light of his formula he found all action due to selfishness. If all selfish action were removed, trade, that is, prosperity, would end. Consequently, he advised the abandonment of the attempt "to make a great an honest hive." But Mr. Kaye's analysis of the *reductio ad absurdum* in Mandeville's thought, in which he holds Bayle's influence paramount, seems somewhat contradictory to his later explanation. In one place he implies that Mandeville, having adopted this theory, turned to an examination of the phenomena of society; in another, that "rigorism" was merely a final twist to a scheme based on a worldly

morality. It is true that Mr. Kaye distinguishes between Mandeville's "rigorism" and the incipient utilitarianism which was to develop such profound influence. And he rightly emphasizes Mandeville's contempt for all transcendentalism. Mandeville was an empiricist, and "an intense one." In holding that the use of the ascetic formula is "simply a final twist given to his thought after it has been worked out in harmony with the opposite or empiric viewpoint"; a "kind of candle-snuffer," indicating his innate opposition to the ascetic ideal, Mr. Kaye appears to abandon "rigorism" as the key to Mandeville's thought.

This "rigorism," after all, seems to differ little from the ethical system, classical in origin, which holds that the rational principle in the soul is a sufficient guide to virtue. It is the theme of the second book of the *Faerie Queene*, for example, in which Divine Grace plays a very slight part, as contrasted with the teaching of the first book, which is ascetic in Mr. Kaye's sense. Spenser keeps the two forms of asceticism perfectly clear and distinct; they are not in the state of unstable equilibrium which Mr. Kaye holds to be the essential characteristic of thought in the seventeenth century. The impression which we ultimately get from Mr. Kaye's exposition is that the rigoristic philosophy, whether in itself an attempt to reconcile two diverse interpretations of virtue or not, is certainly not Mandeville's, which is pure empiricism. In this, of course, Mandeville points the materialistic philosophy of the day, carried even farther than Hobbes; his work is a climax of an intellectual movement whose beginnings in English thought we detect in Spenser and Shakespeare and which was immensely stimulated by the philosophy of progress implicit in Bacon and the new science. Mr. Kaye not only speaks of the rigoristic philosophy as a "final twist" given to Mandeville's thought, but shows, in later sections of his book, that it was bound up with a species of camouflage, a protective coloration, to keep on good terms with the Fundamentalists. Thus, Mr. Kaye holds that Mandeville is "not to be believed" when he professes a preference for "the Road that leads to Virtue." His definition of Virtue, if sincere, would make all progress impossible; he really abandons his position, and prefers the great hive.

Therefore Mr. Kaye concentrates rightly not upon the paradox but upon the empiricism of Mandeville. This he defines as a theory of philosophical anarchism plus utilitarianism in practice. There is no final criterion for conduct. Distinctions are arbitrary, varying with the individual. This does not mean encouragement of vice, for the State punishes crime. The thesis is not that all evil is public benefit, but that some evil may not really be felt to be evil. In his explanation of Mandeville's account of the invention of virtues and of society Mr. Kaye is on sounder ground than Leslie



Stephen, who speaks of it as "this preposterous theory." The theory is an allegory, imitative of many similar accounts in earlier writers, including Lucretius; that it is not to be taken literally is proved by Mandeville's later explanation, in Part II, of his meaning, in which we have a fairly accurate statement of evolutionary theory as applied to the development of civilization.

In the chapter on intellectual background Mr. Kaye draws a useful distinction between Mandeville's conception of irrationality, which was psychological, and the familiar pyrrhonism of the Renaissance. He holds that Mandeville is less interested in proving that reason is impotent than in showing that the process is always at the bidding of some sub-rational desire. He remarks acutely that the popular attitude was a compound of antagonistic intellectual reagents needing only the proper shock of one upon the other to cause an explosion. This shock was supplied by Mandeville. He gained his effect by his consciousness of a contradiction in current opinion which had escaped his contemporaries. This observation is substantiated by the entire essay, which shows not only the intrinsic interest of the *Fable* but also its relations to the thought of the time. Its influence Mr. Kaye outlines at the end of what must be regarded as one of the most considerable and illuminating of recent analyses of a great chapter in the history of English thought.

EDWIN GREENLAW.

---

*The English Versions of The Ship of Fools*, by Fr. Aurelius Pompen, O. F. M. xiv + 345 pp. Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1925.

This impressive study is one of the outstanding contributions of recent years to the interpretation of Early Tudor Literature. As stated in the Introduction, the author has a three-fold purpose: "To bring both Barclay and Watson somewhat nearer to the student of English literature, and correctly to appraise their historical and literary value"; "to throw some light on the methods of the old translators"; and to correct the universal mistake that Barclay knew Brant's *Narrenschiff* and in part translated from it. To this task Fr. Aurelius brings a wide knowledge of the scholarship dealing with the early Renaissance period and an adequate appreciation of method.

Topic by topic the author compares from the earliest editions the original German text by Brant, the Latin text by Locher—a friend of Brant's, Professor of Rhetoric and Poetry at Freiburg—the French verse paraphrase by Riviere, the French prose paraphrase by Drouyn, and the English poetical version by Barclay and prose



version by Watson. "When I began my study," says Fr. Aurelius, "I had no doubt that Barclay made his translation from the German or at least under German influence, as all the handbooks of English literature have it." What he actually discovered was that Barclay does not owe a single line directly to Brant, whose text he could not read, but that, with slight obligation to Riviere, he translates, adapts and amplifies the Latin version of Locher; that Locher, a mere schoolmaster and pedantic devotee of classical patterns, in no sense translated Brant, making, rather, a haphazard selection or paraphrase of a few lines at the beginning of a section, missing altogether the pungency of Brant, and freely introducing his own flat moralizations and classical allusions, reproducing, in short, "hardly a third part of Brant's ideas . . . and not more than a tenth part of his grimmest sarcasm"; and that Barclay in turn reworks Locher into a version four times as long, following in the main the ideas of Locher but adding and amplifying, governed in part by "the unbearable prolixity of an old-fashioned preacher," in part by his homely wit and lively sense of reality. As for Watson, he translates perfunctorily and blunderingly the version of Drouyn, with only a very occasional dash of fresh local color of his own.

A comparative table of all the chapters of *The Ship of Fools* in the different versions and editions furnishes other scholars with a convenient key for further comparative work.

The disappointing feature of the book is the very brief and general chapter of conclusions. Fr. Aurelius does throw a great deal of light on the method of the early translators, and he does correct the Barclay-Brant tradition, but he does not adequately summarize the historical and literary value of Barclay's poem. From the historical point of view, he was in a position to discriminate closely between the attitudes of characteristic German, French and English minds of the early Renaissance toward medieval, humanistic and reformatory ideas; from the literary point of view, he was in a position to analyze the genius of Barclay and to bring into sharp relief the characteristics of the creative genius of early Tudor England.

The subtitle, "A contribution to the history of the early French Renaissance in England," seems to the reviewer rather forced, for though Watson was a mere abject follower of Drouyn, Barclay—if I have read the parallels aright—worked with a good deal of rather sturdy independence, and, though ignorant of Brant's work, actually reintroduced into the poem much of the idiomatic vigor and spirit of homely satire which distinguished the first version. In this respect the comparative study illustrates the sturdiness and independence of the Teutonic genius at this period.

One hesitates, however, to find fault with so scholarly a book,

which makes English philologists permanently indebted to the author.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD.

University of Washington.

---

"*La Fée aux Miettes.*" *Essai sur le rôle du subconscient dans l'œuvre de Charles Nodier.* Par JULES VODOZ. Paris, Champion, 1925. xvi + 321 pp.

The patently autobiographic character of Nodier's longest fairy-tale is the subject of this psycho-analytic study.

Je n'ai point d'autres souvenirs que ceux de l'enfance, et le dégoût du présent, qui s'est accru avec mes années, a dû fortifier en moi l'habitude instinctive de vivre dans le passé . . . depuis les jours du désabusement, où j'ai reconnu que, hors la vie de l'enfant, il n'y avait rien dans la vie qui valût la peine de vivre . . . Je me suis conservé enfant, par dédain d'être homme. Voilà le secret de ma mémoire et de mes livres.

Thus Nodier in his *Souvenirs de la révolution* (1833, pp. 249-250). Finding here a manifestation of the mother-complex, Monsieur Vodoz confronts the incidents of *La Fée aux Miettes* with those of Nodier's youth, unhappily too often colored, in the *Souvenirs*, by a Romantic imagination. This ingenious but exasperating parallelism loses force by trying to explain everything. The hero Michel is a carpenter, because in 1830 Nodier's star was paling before Hugo's: "après avoir . . . contribué à édifier la charpente du romantisme (sic), il était devenu le charpentier que la déveine accompagne. . ." (p. 71). Psycho-analysis certainly offers large opportunities! For the fairy is first a symbol of the ideal mother denied to Nodier, plus his desire of an intellectual career, then the bride he wedded after falling in love with her mother, then his daughter Marie, whose marriage in 1830 provoked the crisis which produced the story, then *La Sagesse*, and finally the acceptance by the author of his unconscious self and all its desires. This finale might have been supported by the revelations on his later life made by Balzac to Mme Hanska! The bailiff of the Isle of Man represents his carnal nature (man, le vieil homme), the dog is a symbol of the incest-motive. The zeal spent in over-elaborating this thesis (the six trees in Michel's garden are compared to the six days of the Creation) might better have been devoted to the question of the literary sources, equally important in a bibliophile and a dreamer alive to all the symbols of folk-lore and rich in mythopoeic fancy. The initial impulse might well have come from Emerson's precursor, Azaïs, for Nodier reviewed his philosophy of compensation in the *Journal des Débats* of 1816. Certainly, the polygraph's desire to be buried with his daughter's wedding veil as shroud and his wife's name on a scarf across his

heart would seem to prove that the father's love remained to the end unconscious of sex, in those far abysses of the heart which Sainte-Beuve wisely refrained from plumbing; and no revelation of the volume sullies the image of the lovely girl who still lives for us in one of the plates of M. Maigron's *Le romantisme et la mode*. M. Vodoz has done everyone a great service by the 30 page analysis he gives of the romance, and he affords the reader a chance to view, inverted and reflected in a double mirror, a personality which still remains as Protean and ambiguous as it probably was to its possessor.

L. PIAGET SHANKS.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Band 3-5.* Hrsg. von GEORG MINDE-POUET und JULIUS PETERSEN. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1925.

Volumes 3 and 4 in reality constitute but a single volume of 230 pages, with the sub-title *Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft 1923 und 1924*. The most important article in it is by Maria Prigge-Kruhoeffter: "Heinrich von Kleist. Religiosität und Charakter," which takes up more than one third of the volume. Other essays are by Otto Reuter, on Kleist's "Ideenmagazin"; F. K. Roedenmeyer, on *Robert Guiskard*; Walther Kienast, on *Michael Kohlhaas*; Helmuth Rogge, on Kleist and Rahel; Julius Petersen, on Varnhagen and Kleist. Arthur Eloesser reproduces several Kleist portraits, while Otto Pniower contributes two of Henriette Vogel. In addition there are a genealogy of the descendants of Kleist's brother and sisters, a description of the new Kleist-Museum at Frankfort a. O., and a statistical enumeration of the performances of Kleist's plays during the year 1923-24. Finally, Georg Minde-Pouet has again compiled a most valuable *Kleist-Bibliography* for 1923 and 1924.

The sub-title of the fifth volume of the *Schriften* is: *Kleist's letzte Stunden*, Von Georg Minde-Pouet. Only Part I (*Das Akten-Material*) is here offered. It comprises all the documents, official and private, that have reference to Kleist's death. The bulk of the documents in question was found among the papers of Marie von Kleist, and while one or two had previously been published, it is only in their entirety that we get an authentic picture of the last hours of Kleist and his companion in death. A commentary by the editor is promised for the near future.

It is hardly necessary to add that the *Schriften* of the *Kleist-Gesellschaft* are indispensable to every student of German Literature.

W. KURRELMMEYER.

*Chryseide et Arimant, Tragicomédie de Jean Mairet (1625).*

Edition critique par H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER avec la collaboration de C. B. Beall, Joséphine de Boer, Mary Bunworth, G. L. Burton, Eunice R. Goddard, Ruth Rogers. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1925. 174 pp. Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, v.

This edition offers a scientifically established text, based on the 1630 edition of Rouen with the variants of the Paris edition of the same year and of the Rouen reprint of 1639, ample footnote material, a *glossaire sommaire* of obsolete and rare words and a prefatory study of the poet and his work. The first dozen pages of the Introduction (to p. 19) present a very clear, concise and, at the same time, engaging summary of what is known concerning the life of Mairet. It fixes as far as possible the contested dates, of which there have been not a few, and establishes his importance in the contemporary dramatic development.

Pages nineteen to twenty-eight discuss the sources and literary influences. The relation of the plot to its source, the *Astrée* of d'Urfé, is treated in general with the details left to the footnote parallels which accompany the text. As for the literary influences it appears that Mairet: "Reçoit beaucoup de suggestions de Théophile de Viau, dont il allait être bientôt l'ami intime" (p. 23); and "respecte les bienséances, mais c'est à cause des mœurs littéraires de sa génération plutôt que des règles du théâtre" (p. 25). These statements in their setting give a very clear notion of Mairet from Besançon who, about 1625, seeks to make his way in Paris with this, his first dramatic production. He is quoted (p. 34) as disclaiming any knowledge at this time of the rules which were to be largely indebted to him for their long domination in French dramatic composition. Like Corneille, in his first dramatic effort, he asserts (p. 35): "Je n'avois point de meilleur guide que le sens commun." Nor had he as yet been affected by Malherbe's prescriptions regarding the art of making verse, for here too: "Mairet suit Théophile plutôt que Malherbe" (p. 23; cf. also pages 27 and 29). It is a glimpse of the French drama at a time when it was entering upon one of its most kaleidoscopic developments.

The treatment of the language of the *Chryseide* (pp. 28-32) is admirably succinct and clear and gives the impression of containing all that one needs to know upon this subject. The last few pages are concerned with the representation of the play and the contemporary editions. The notes contain, beside the text variants and the source details, critical comment and parallel verses from contemporary poets quite sufficient to suggest the relation of the poet and his tragi-comedy to the literature of his time.

The text is presented: "avec son ortographe, son accentuation, sa ponctuation, aussi exactement que possible." This fidelity is preserved even to the, at first, somewhat disconcerting arrangement of the verses broken by the dialogue:

Alexandre  
Je n'en veux point douter.  
Bellimand  
Et c'est aussi pourquoy  
Je prens la liberté de me servir de toy. (v. 23-24)

From the second scene of the third act to the end of the play the modern practice is followed. A reviewer in the *Revue Critique* has suggested that in verse 91: "Son sang fut plus sanglant que celui d'Illion," *sort* should be substituted for *sang*, although this word occurs in all the contemporary editions. Professor Lancaster writes that he is inclined to accept this emendation.

For years our studies in the early centuries of modern French Literature have been limited largely to the consideration of texts made accessible through publications like the series of Les Grands Ecrivains, La Société des Textes Modernes and the hazards of a limited number of anthologies. It has been next to impossible to procure for our libraries many a text which, in its day, was as popular, as significant, and as potently influential as those which have found greater favor in the eyes of posterity. There could be no greater service to American scholarship than the publication of these works so essential and so difficult of access. Professor Lancaster's selection was a most judicious one. The *Chryséide et Arimant*, with its germs of psychological development (cf. especially the notes to verses 899 ff. and to 1659 ff.) marks an important phase in the evolution of French classic drama; a step in advance of Hardy, a half-step in advance of Théophile, a precursor to his own later work and to that of his contemporaries. It is an impressive solution of the problem: how to combine graduate training and scholarly production.

COLBERT SEARLES.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

*The Early Novels of Paul Bourget*, by EDGAR MILTON BOWMAN,  
Professor of Romance Languages in Dickinson College. New  
York: Carranza, 1925. 116 pp.

Professor Bowman in his dissertation on the early novels of Bourget, presented at Columbia University, inserts his wedge between *Le Fantôme* and *L'Etape* and the novels fall into two neat groups. On page 50 Professor Bowman informs us that "in the



first group the author (Bourget) aims to learn as much as possible concerning the human heart in general from the particular heart he presents. In the second group he studies some contemporary problems, not solely to understand it (sic) but also to give what he considers the solution."

Such a grouping, based entirely on the date of appearance of the novels, seems extremely arbitrary. Professor Bowman seems to feel this, for in his brief summaries of the novels of the second period on pages 47-48 we read such tempering phrases as: *L'Emigré*: A study of an attitude of mind and therefore resembles novels of the first period; *Némésis*: Seems to revert to his first manner, having much in common with *Cosmopolis*; *La Geôle*: A study of heredity such as Bourget might have written before 1900; etc.

Concerning Professor Bowman's first group it seems to be far from the facts and from Bourget's idea to claim that *Le Disciple* and *La Terre Promise*, to give two outstanding examples, were written purely for the purpose of indulging in psychological analysis. The brief summaries have shown us how unsteadily some of the novels in the second group occupy their places. However, having grouped the novels thus, and having evidenced good faith by giving this brief résumé of each of the second group, Professor Bowman proceeds to examine in detail those of the early period. The plot of each novel is analysed carefully, the chief characters passed in review and in the conclusion, page 102, we see that

Bourget was primarily interested in psychology, desiring to study the states of consciousness of his men and women from the point of view of the scientist and philosopher.

and that

the trait that distinguishes the novels from those of any other author lies in the unifying similarity of the kind of characters which Bourget has chosen to study. Bourget is, when we consider only the novels of this period, the outstanding novelist of certain weaknesses of the younger generation of the last two decades of the nineteenth century in France.

The present reviewer must take issue with Professor Bowman in regard to his translations. In a work which is intended for perusal by specialists, the method is distinctly unscholarly. Only very infrequently are we trusted with the original. Here and there we come upon such stock phrases as "les petits faits de conscience," "les plus minuscules ressorts intimes," etc.; now and then a foot-note is found entire in the original, and, of course, no attempt is made at translating the poetry quoted. One might indeed pardon this lack of consistency, if the translations were always done with the deft stroke of a hand which can banish all reminiscence of odors of mopped floors and washed blackboards, but this is not the case. For instance, on p. 93, there is this bit from *Une Idylle Tragique*: "He had of this age of deep and tragic



turmoil through which we are passing the fatal mark, because it is an infallible mark of decadence in a race."<sup>1</sup>

It is necessary to accuse the author of merely filling space in at least one spot. On p. 19 he says, "To Bourget and his novels one can aptly apply his own words concerning Flaubert." He then launches into a quotation from Bourget which fills half of the page, all of which is quite beside the point except the first sentence of about a dozen words.

There is a good bibliography at the end of the work. Except for it one wonders just what contribution this dissertation makes to our knowledge of Bourget.

JAMES D. SORBER.

*Yale University.*

---

*Ronsard et son Temps.* Par PIERRE CHAMPION. 24 phototypies hors texte. Paris: Champion, 1925. xviii + 508 pp.

After Laumonier, Longnon, Cohen, de Nolhac, what has a new book of such considerable dimensions to add to our knowledge of Ronsard? M. Champion evidently anticipated this question, for he has undertaken not to make a contribution to literary history or aesthetic criticism, but to write a biography of the poet and the persons to whom he dedicated his poems. As Ronsard was all his life in close association with the court, M. C. gives us portraits of most of the Valois with their celebrated wives and the ladies-in-waiting of the latter, including Cassandre, Hélène, Isabeau, Madeleine de Laubespine. The pageant of the sixteenth century, its festivals and massacres, passes before us as we read and the whole is given unity by the rich and contradictory personality of the poet, while the interest is heightened by frequent quotations from his work and by numerous and well chosen illustrations. At the same time it is a valuable book for the scholar, for the author has read extensively in recent Ronsard literature and has added considerable information from his own historical researches. One finds, for instance, details about Ronsard's life in his province as well as at Paris, his controversies with the Protestants, his connection with the academy of Henri III, etc., that are seldom met with elsewhere. It is an admirable contribution to sixteenth century scholarship, the most imposing that the Tercentenary of Ronsard has produced.<sup>1</sup>

H. C. LANCASTER.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also on page 56 the sentence beginning, "To define a few examples."

<sup>2</sup> Admirers of Mr. Coolidge will be interested in the following (p. 29): "Quand Ronsard sera vieux, il aura toujours un chevalet de bois dans son prieuré; il s'exercera à sauter par la volte, quand il fait mauvais temps."

*Autour de Voltaire, avec quelques inédits.* By F. VÉZINET. Paris, Champion, 1925. viii, 141 pp.

Ce petit volume contient cinq études séparées sur Voltaire et "autour de Voltaire." Trois d'entre elles, qui auraient pu être groupées (*Voltaire et son homme d'affaires à Ferney*, 1-63; *Simon Bigex et le Père Adam*, 90-98 et *Les Crassy et la générosité de Voltaire*, 98-121), ajoutent quelques renseignements intéressants au livre de M. Caussy et aideront à compléter la silhouette de Voltaire seigneur de village qu'il avait esquissée. Voltaire s'y montre âpre à défendre ses intérêts et ses bois, zélé dans la défense de ses serviteurs et prêt à jouer de mauvais tours aux Jésuites. L'étude sur *L'Affaire du chevalier de la Barre et sa répercussion sur Voltaire*, mise au point d'un épisode fort connu, contient en conclusion un inédit assez piquant. On trouvera une nouvelle preuve de la sincérité de Voltaire dans son opposition à la peine de mort dans la lettre qu'il écrivit à Balleidier, procureur de Gez, pour prendre la défense d'un assez mauvais garçon accusé d'avoir volé et violé une passante sur la grande route de Ferney. Voltaire demande qu'on se borne à prendre un arrêt d'expulsion contre "ce malheureux qui est Savoyard" et souhaite qu'il s'en aille "voler ou violer toutes les Savoyardes qu'il lui plairait" (p. 188). La dernière étude du volume, *Rousseau ou Diderot?* reprend la question tant de fois débattue de l'origine du *Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts*. M. Vézinet fait la critique des témoignages, met en lumière les contradictions nombreuses de Diderot, insiste sur les déformations évidentes que son imagination infligea en maintes circonstances à la réalité et conclut à la véracité de Rousseau. Il est vrai que Diderot, comme le montre habilement M. Vézinet n'a jamais réclaté formellement, au moins par écrit, la paternité de l'idée centrale du *Discours*, même s'il semble l'avoir souvent fait dans des conversations. Il serait cependant facile de répondre que Rousseau n'a écrit la première version de la fameuse extase qui l'aurait saisi sur la route de Vincennes que douze ans après l'emprisonnement de Diderot et ses visites au donjon (*Lettre à M. de Malesherbes*, 12 janvier 1762), et qu'il a pu lui aussi se laisser piper par son imagination. En l'absence de tout témoignage strictement contemporain le problème risque fort de n'être jamais résolu et fournira encore longtemps un sujet de discussion aux rousseauistes.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

Bissell, Benjamin.—The American Indian in English Literature of the Eighteenth Century. [Yale Studies in English.] *New Haven*: Yale Press, 1925. ix + 223 pp.

British Academy.—Proceedings, 1921-1923. *London*: For the British Academy by Henry Milford, 1926. xx + 579 pp. 40 sh.

Campbell, Kathleen, ed.—Poems on Several Occasions written in the XVIIIth Century. [Percy Reprints.] *Oxford*: Basil Blackwell, 1926. 6 sh.

Carlton, W. J.—Charles Dickens Short-hand Writer. *London*: Cecil Palmer, 1926. 7 sh. 6 d.

Crichton-Browne, Sir James.—Burns from a New Point of View. *London*: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926. vii + 92 pp. 3 sh. 6 d.

Dobrée, Bonamy.—Timotheus: the Future of the Theatre. *London*: Kegan Paul, 1925. 2 sh. 6 d.

Donne, John.—Devotions upon Emergent Occasions. Together with Death's Duell. With an Introduction by William H. Draper. *London*: Simpkin, Marshall, 1926. lxvii + 192 pp. 3 sh. 6 d.

Drew, Elizabeth A.—The Modern Novel. *New York*: Harcourt, 1926. \$2.00.

Fielding, Henry.—An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews, ed. R. Brimley Johnson. *Waltham Saint Lawrence, Twyford*: Golden Cockerel Press, 1926. 15 sh.

Frierson, W. C.—L'Influence du naturalisme français sur les romanciers anglais de 1885 à 1900. *Paris*: M. Giard, 1925. 20 fr.

Flasdieck, H. M. ed.—John Brown's Dissertation on Poetry and Music (1764). *Halle*: M. Niemeyer, 1924. 5 M.

Godwin, William.—An Enquiry concerning Political Justice, ed. R. A. Preston. Foreword by Lindsay Rogers. *New York*: Knopf, 1926. 2 vols., 306, 307 pp. \$4.00.

Günther, E.—D. Defoes und J. Swifts Belesenheit und Literarische Kritik. (Palästra, cxlix). *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1925. 117 pp. 9 M.

Hadow, Sir W. H.—A Comparison of Poetry and Music. The Henry Sidgwick Lecture, 1925. *Cambridge*: 1926. 2 sh. 6 d.

Le Gallienne, Richard.—The Romantic '90's. *Garden City*: Doubleday, Page, 1925. 271 pp. \$2.50.

Lucas, F. L.—Authors Dead and Living. *London*: Chatto & Windus, 1926. 7 sh. 6 d.

MacCallum, M. W.—The Dramatic Monologue in The Victorian Period. (British Academy, Warton Lecture, XVI.) *London*: H. Milford, 1925. 1 sh.

Mackail, J. W.—Studies of English Poets. *London*: Longmans, 1925. 10 sh. 6 d.

Magnus, Laurie.—A Dictionary of European Literature. *London*: Routledge, 1926. 25 sh.

Melville, Lewis.—Lady Mary Wortley Montague. Her Life and Letters. *Boston*: Houghton, Mifflin, 1925. \$5.00.

Moore, John B.—The Comic and Realistic in English Drama. *Chicago*: University of Chicago Press, 1925. 231 pp. \$2.00.

Murphy, Arthur.—The Way to Keep Him, a Comedy. *London*: Milford, 1926. viii + 131 pp. 1 sh.

Pickering, L. P.—Lord Byron, Leigh Hunt, and the "Liberal." *London*: Drane's, 1925. 7 sh. 6 d.

Powell, A. E.—The Romantic Theory of Poetry: An Examination in the Light of Croce's Aesthetic. *New York*: Longmans, 1926. \$4.50.

Praz, M.—Secentismo e marinismo in Inghilterra: John Donne, Richard Crashaw. *Firenze*: Ed. "La Voce," 1925. xiii + 294 pp. L. 30.

Read, Herbert.—Reason and Romanticism. Essays in Literary Criticism. *London*: Faber & Gwyer, 1926. 7 sh. 6 d.

Réborà, P.—L'Italia nel dramma inglese, 1558-1642. *Milan*: Modernissima, 1925. L. 15.

Senancourt, Robert.—India in English Literature. *London*: Simpkin, Marshall, 1926. 18 sh.

Shelley, P. B.—The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library, ed. R. H. Hill. *Oxford*: Bodleian Library, 1926. xv + 48 pp. 5 sh.

Turner, F. McD. C.—The Element of Irony in English Literature. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1926. vii + 109 pp. 5 sh.

Watson, Ernest B.—Sheridan to Robertson. *Cambridge (Mass.)*: Harvard Press, 1926. \$5.00.

Wilde, Oscar.—Letzte Briefe. Translated into German by Max Meyerfeld. *Berlin*: S. Fischer, 1925. 173 pp.

Woodforde, James.—The Diary of a Country Parson, ed. John Beresford, vol. II, 1782-7. *Oxford*: University Press, 1926. 12 sh. 6 d.

Wright, J. C.—The Story of the Brontës. *London*: L. Parsons, 1925. 5 sh.

## GERMAN

Alexis, Willibald.—Dreimal in Weimar. Erinnerungen an Goethe. Neu hrsg. v. K. Meyer-Rotermund. *Wolfenbüttel*: Heckner [1926]. 20 pp. 60 Pf.

Baesecke, G.—Die deutsche Literatur des Rheingebietes im MA. *Halle*: Waisenhaus, 1926. Pp. xi, 150-158. 80 Pf.

Campe, J. H.—Robinson der Jüngere. Abridged and ed. with vocab. by C. H. Ibershoff. *Boston*: Heath, 1925. v, 201 pp.

Dahmen, H.—Lehren über Kunst und Weltanschauung im Kreise um Stefan George. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1926. 70 pp. M. 3.

Ebrard, F. C.—Johann Georg Bartholmä 1806-1839. Sein Lebensgang, s. schriftsteller. Tätigkeit u. s. kom. Studentenepos "Die Ritter der Nacht." *Erlangen*: Junge & Sohn, 1926. 48 pp. M. 2.

Funk, Philipp.—Von der Aufklärung zur Romantik. Studien zur Vorgeschichte d. Münchner Romantik. *München*: J. Kösel & F. Pustet, 1925. vii, 212 pp. M. 5.50.

Geithner, Oskar.—Goethes Weltanschauung u. Religion. *Naumburg a. d. S.*: H. Sieling, 1926. 24 pp. M. 1.

Harten-Hoencke, Toni.—Amerikanische Lyrik, Übersetzt von —. Eingel. von Fr. Schönmeyer. [Kunstwart-Bücherei, 33. Bd.] *München*: Callway, 1925. 108 pp. Boards, M. 1.50.

Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts. Jg. 32. 1916-1925. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Gebr. Knauer [1926]. iv, 252 pp. Cloth, M. 10.

Kaiser, H.—Die Mundart von Hof a. d. Saale. Diss. *Erlangen*: 1924. 60 pp.

Leyen, Friedr. v. d.—Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. Ein Überblick. *München*: F. Bruckmann, 1926. vii, 131 pp. M. 4.

Minde-Pouet, Georg.—Kleists letzte Stunden. Tl. 1. Das Akten-Material. [Schriften d. Kleist-Ges. Bd. 5]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1926. 62 pp. M. 4.

Neumann, Friedr.—Der Altonaer "Joseph" u. d. junge Goethe. Ein Beitr. z. Gesch. d. nhd. Reinsprache. [S.-A. aus Germanica]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. 41 pp. M. 1.20.

Ranke, Friedrich.—Die Allegorie der Minnegrotte in Gottfrieds Tristan. [Schr. d. Königsberger Gel. Ges. Geisteswissensch. Kl. 2. Jahr, Hft. 2]. *Berlin*: Deutsche Verlagsges. f. Politik u. Geschichte, 1925. 19 pp. M. 1.50.

Scheffel, Jos. Victor v.—Briefe ins Elternhaus. 1843-1849. (Ein Bild s. Jugend.) Eingel. u. hrsg. v. W. Zentner. *Karlsruhe*: Armin Gräff, 1926. xxxvii, 297 pp. M. 9.

Thalmann, Marianne.—Gestaltungsfragen der Lyrik. *München*: Hueber, 1925. 125 pp. M. 5.50.

Urbahn, Elis.—Die Symbolik in C. F. Meyers Gedichten. [S.-A. aus "Edda."] *Oslo*: 1925, 114 pp.

Wolter, Franz.—Franz Poggi als Simplissimus der Romantik. *München*: H. Schmidt, 1926. M. 12.

## FRENCH

Addamiano, N.—Il Rinascimento in Francia, Pietro Ronsard. *Palermo*: Sandron, 1925. 562 pp.

Aebischer, Paul.—Trois farces françaises inédites trouvées à Fribourg. *Paris*: Ed. Champion (1925). 64 pp. Fr. 10.

Allenspach, M.—Gustave Flaubert: La Tentation de Saint Antoine. Diss. *Zürich*: 109 pp.

Altfranz. Liedersammlung.—Hrsg. v. J. Spanke. *Halle*: Niemeyer. viii + 454 pp. M. 12. [Rom. Bibl. 22]

Arsovitch.—Pascal et l'expérience du Puy-de-Dôme. *Montpellier*: Firmin et Montane, 1925. 76 pp.

Azorin.—Racine y Molière. *Madrid*: Imp. Cuidad Lineal, 1925. (Cuadernos literarios.)

Badaire, J.—Précis de litt. fr. *New York*: Heath, 1926. xvii + 286 pp. \$1.60.

Barthou, L.—Voyage à travers mes livres. Autour de Lamartine. *Paris*: Payot, 1925. 224 pp. Fr. 12.

Baudelaire.—Les Fleurs du mal, trans. by L. P. Shanks. *New York*: Holt, 1926. xvi + 278 pp. \$3.

Beaunier, A.—Vie amoureuse de Julie de Lespinasse. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1925. 191 pp. Fr. 7.

Behrens, u. Karstien.—Geschütz- und Geschosslaute im Weltkrieg. *Giessen*: Roman. Sem. d. Universität, 1925. 79 pp. M. 2.70.

Bodmer, E.—"Empros." Abzählreime der franz. Schweiz. Diss. *Zürich*. 110 pp.

Bonneau, G.—Samain, poète symboliste. *Paris*: Mercure de Fr., 1925. 267 pp. Fr. 9.

Boulenger, J.—Rabelais à travers les âges. *Paris*: le Divan, 1925. 247 pp. Fr. 20.

Brunot, F.—Hist. de la langue fr. T. VII. La propagation du fr. en France jusqu'à la fin de l'ancien régime. *Paris*: Colin, 1926. 360 pp.

Buffenoir, H.—Historique d'un ms. de la Nouvelle Héloïse. *Paris*: Charavay, 1926. 23 pp. Fr. 3.

Carmagnola-Richard.—Berthe Vadier et une corresp. inéd. de H. F. Amiel. *Genève*: Robert, 1925. 411 pp.



Cattanes, H.—Causons un peu. *New York*: Doubleday, 1925. \$1.50.

Cerf, L.—Le reliquaire de Lamartine. *Paris*: Hachette, 1925. 153 pp.

Chamfort.—Caractères et anecdotes, éd. p. Van Bever. *Paris*: Crès, 1924.

Chansonnier d'Arras, fac-simile du ms. 657 de la Bibl. d'Arras, éd. par A. Jeanroy. *Paris*: Champion. Fr. 100.

Chateaubriand.—Las aventuras du dernier Abencérage ed. by F. E. Schneegans. *Strasbourg*: Heitz (1925). 59 pp. Fr. 1.50. [Bibl. Rom.]

Cherel, A.—En relisant, après la guerre, Bazin, Bourget, Barrès. *Paris*: Gigord, 1925. 220 pp.

Comfort, W. W.—Practical Fr. comp. *Boston*: Heath, 1926. vii + 151 pp. \$1.

Corneau, H.—L'Accent de chez nous, essai d'une phonétique du Bas-Anjou. *Paris*: Crès, 1922. xiii + 312 pp.

Daudet.—Tartarin de Tarascon, ed. L. P. Irvin. *New York*: Holt, 1926. xxiii + 247 pp. 80 cts.

Deck, Suzanne.—Une commune normande au moyen âge. La Ville d'Eu. Son histoire. Ses institutions (1151-1475). [Bibl. de l'Ecole des hautes études]. *Paris*: Edouard Champion, 1924. xxiv + 316 pp.

Desbeaux, E.—Trois petits mousquetaires, ed. S. Roth. *Boston*: Allyn & Bacon, 1926. xi + 208 pp.

Destutt de Tracy.—De l'amour, ed. G. Chinar. *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1926. lvii + 81 pp.

Dorchain, A.—La Première de Mélite. *Rouen*: Lainé, 1925. 20 pp.

Duclaux, M.—The Life of Racine. *New York*: Harper (1926). 256 pp. \$4.

Dufour, Th.—Recherches bibliographiques sur les œuvres impr. de J.-J. Rousseau. I. *Paris*: Giraud-Badin, 1925. xi + 273 pp.

Dugas, L.—Les timides dans la litt. et l'art. *Paris*: Alcan, 1925. iv + 155 pp.

Durry, J.—Stendhal et la police pontificale. *Paris*: Champion, 1925. 18 pp.

Esnault, Gaston.—L'Imagination populaire. Métaphores occidentales. Essai sur le fr. parlé en Basse-Bretagne comparé avec les Patois fr. *Paris*: Presses Univ. 348 pp. Fr. 35.

Estaunié, E.—L'Appel de la route. ed. M. L. Henry. *Boston*: Ginn, 1926. xxviii + 339 pp. \$1.56. [Contemporary France in lit.]

Etudes françaises. 6e cahier. Etudes et aventures pathéliniennes (R. T. Holbrook); L'étudiant et le schôlar (R. Michaud); Litt. comp. et litt. gén. aux Etats-Unis (F. Schoell). *Paris*: Belles Lettres, 1925. 60 pp.

Fabrick, P.—La constr. rel. dans Chrétien de Troyes. Groningen diss. *Amsterdam*: H. J. Paris.

Ferrari, L.—Le Traduzioni italiane del teatro tragico Francese nei secoli XVII e XVIII. *Paris*: Champion, 1925. xxiii + 311 pp. [Bibl. de la R. L. C.]

Forst-Battaglia, O.—Die franz. Lit. der Gegenwart. 1870-1924. *Wiesbaden*: Diöskuren, 1925. iv + 443 pp.

France, A.—Dernières pages, pub. p. M. Corday. *Paris*: Calmann-Lévy, 1925. ii + 203 pp. Fr. 10.

—Différents souvenirs de jeunesse, ed. V. F. Boyson. *New York*: Oxford, 1925. 100 pp. 50 cts.

Frey, M.—Les transformations du vocab. fr. (1789-1800). *Paris*: Presses univ. 300 pp. Fr. 15.

Hastings, W. S.—French Prose and Poetry (1850-1900). *Boston*: Ginn, 1926. xxiv + 413 pp. \$1.72.

Henke, W.—Das Meer in der franz. Dichtung des 19. Jahrh. Diss. *Greifswald*. 90 pp.

Hugo.—Les Misérables, ed. by Dubrule and Sumichrast. *Boston*: Ginn, 1925. xvi + 414 pp.

—Ruy Blas, revised ed. with vocab. by K. McKenzie. *New York*: Holt, 1926. xxix + 258 pp.

Kapp, M.—Die Frauengestalten in Molières Werken. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1925. 51 pp.

Klinghardt, u. Olbrich.—Franz. Intimationsübungen. 2. *Leipzig*: Quelle & Meyer, 1925. vii + 126, 36 pp. M. 6.

Lahorgue, P. L.—Le Réalisme de Pascal. *Paris*: Beauchesne, 1925. 319 pp.

Lapaire, Hugues.—Le patois berrichon. *Paris*: J. Gamber. 154 pp. 6 fr.

Latreille, C.—Les dernières années de Lamartine. *Paris*: Perrin, 1925. xii + 279 pp. Fr. 7.50.

—La mère de Lamartine. *Paris*: Van Oest, 1925. 89 pp.

Lebrun et Toisoul.—Dict. étymol. de la langue fr. *Paris*: Nathan, 1925. xxi + 882 pp.

Lemaire de Belges, Jean.—Dichtungen. (Bibl. Notiz: E. Lommatzsch.) *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1924. xvi + 160 pp. M. 2.40. [Rom. Texte 7.]

Lerch, E.—Hist. franz. Syntax. I. *Leipzig*: Reisland, 1925. 327 pp. M. 16.

Letourneux, G.—Ronsard était-il prêtre? *Laval*: Goupil, 1925. 38 pp.

Loseth, E.—Le Tristan et le Palamède des mss. de Rome et de Florence. *Kristiania*: Dybwad. 139 pp. Kr. 50.

Lyonnet, H.—Mlle Molière. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1925. 137 pp. Fr. 12.

Malvy, A.—Pascal et le problème de la croyance. *Paris*: Beauchesne, 1925. 115 pp. Fr. 4.50.

Marcel, L.—La sœur de Diderot. *Lan-gres*: impr. langroise, 1925. 48 pp.

Marmelstein, J. W.—Étude comp. des textes lat. et fr. de l'inst. de la relig. chrest. p. J. Calvin. Diss. *Groningen*: Wolters. 133 pp.

Martino, P.—Parnasse et symbolisme. *Paris*: Colin, 1925. 220 pp. Fr. 7.

Maynard, F.—Odes et sonnets, éd. p. F. Gohin. *Paris*: Garnier, 1925. 88 pp.

Michaut, G.—Les Luttes de Molière. *Paris*: Hachette, 1925. 249 pp. Fr. 12.

Molt, P. M.—An Intermediate French Grammar. *Boston*: Ginn, 1926. vii + 197 pp. \$1.32.

Montaigne.—Essais, ed. by A. Armain-gaud. 3 vols. *Paris*: Conard, 1925. xx + 1547 pp. Fr. 75.

Moore, O. H.—The young king Henry Plantagenet in hist., lit. and tradition. *Columbus*: Ohio State Univ., 1925. viii + 107 pp. [O. State Studies, II]

Mornet, D.—Hist. des grandes œuvres de la litt. fr. *Paris*: Larousse, 1925. 260 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Nolhac, P. de.—Pascal en Auvergne. *Paris*: Maison du livre, 1925. 32 pp. Fr. 8.

Plattard, J.—La Renaissance des lettres en France de Louis XII à Henri IV. *Paris*: Colin, 1925. 220 pp. Fr. 6.

Régner, H. de.—Baudelaire et les Fleurs du mal. *Paris*: Presses fr., 1925. 83 pp.

Renart, Jean.—Le Roman de l'Écoufle. Mis en rime ancienne en prose nouvelle par André Mary. [Collection Médiévale.] *Paris*: Boivin & Cie. Fr. 12.

Résurrection du Sauveur mystère anglo-normand du XIIIe s., publ. p. F. E. Schneegans. *Strasbourg*: Heitz (1905). Fr. 1.50. [Bibl. Rom.]

Rohr, F.—Parzival und der heilige Gral, eine neue Deutung der Symbolik der Graldichtungen. *Hildesheim*: F. Borgmeyer, 1922. 420 pp.

Ronsard.—Œuvres complètes. IV. Les Amours, éd. crit. par P. Laumonier. *Paris*: Hachette, 1925. xxiv + 258 pp. Fr. 20.

Sainéan, L.—Les sources indigènes de l'étym. fr. 2 vols. *Paris*: Boccard. 982 pp. Fr. 100.

Tobler-Lommatzsch.—Altfranz. Wörterbuch. I (A-B). *Berlin*: Weidmann, iv + 1212 pp.

Verne, J.—Le tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours, ed. by A. Green. *New York*: Heath, 1926. x + 301 pp.

Vigny.—Poésies complètes, éd. p. A. Dorchain. *Paris*: Garnier, 1925. li + 383 pp. Fr. 30.

Waxman, S. M.—Antoine and the Théâtre-libre. *Cambridge*: Harvard Press, 1926. viii + 247 pp. \$3.

Wijk, W. van der.—La première éd. du dic. fr. de Richelet. Diss. *Amsterdam*. *Dordrecht*: Naber. 149 pp.

Williams, E. B.—Technical and scientific French. *New York*: Heath, 1926. vii + 428 pp. \$1.88.

Zauner, A.—Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. II. *Berlin*: Gruyter, 1926. 130 pp.

### ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Il divorzio. Commédia a cura e con prefazione di E. Allodoli. *Milano*: Casa edit. Sonzogno, 1925. 96 pp. L. 1.20. (Biblioteca universale, no. 202.)

Alfonso, P.—Nuova redazione d'un frammento in volgare toscano della "Disciplina clericalis" pubblicata da A. Schiaffini. *Firenze*: G. Carnesecchi e figli, 1924. 20 pp. (Nozze Res-Frosali.)

Angiolieri, Cecco.—Il canzoniere. Introduzione e commento di C. Steiner. *Torino*: Unione tip. ed. Torinese, 1925. xxviii + 164 pp. L. 8. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, vol. 6.)

Batacchi, D. L.—Amina. *Firenze*: Casa ed. ital. Quattrini, 1925. 104 pp. L. 3. (Romanzi audaci, no. 16.)

Bertoni, G.—Lodovico Ariosto. *Roma*: A. F. Formiggini, 1925. 80 pp. L. 3.75. (Profili, no. 76.)

Campari, A.—La poesia di Giovanni Pascoli. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. 148 pp. L. 12.

Casti, Giambattista.—Novelle, a cura di A. Germonti. Tomo primo, secondo e terzo. *Milano*: "L'Aristocratica," 1925. 3 vols., 254; 198; 193 pp. L. 15 each. (Collana di testi e documenti per servire alla storia dei costumi. I classici dell'amore, nos. 21, 23, 25.)

Còcola, F.—Vocabolario dialettale-biscegliese-italiano con note filologiche delle voci di difficile interpretazione. *Trani*: Tip. edit. Paganelli, 1925. 227 pp. L. 11.

Collino, L.—Santorre di Santarosa letterato romantico, con scritti inediti. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1925. 49 pp. L. 4.20.

Curto, C.—Le tre donne benedette nella Commedia di Dante. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. 32 pp. L. 4.



De Angelis, L.—Appunti storico-estetici della letteratura italiana: il Medioevo. *Trani*: Tip. ed. Paganelli, 1925. 94 pp.

De Camillis, Maria.—Domenico Gnoli letterato e poeta. *Napoli*: Soc. ed. F. Perrella, 1925. viii + 287 pp. L. 15. (Studi e ritratti: collezione di monografie letterarie.)

Del Bene, Sennuccio.—Le Rime, a cura di M. De Szombathely. *Bologna-Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1925. 32 pp. L. 3.50.

Donati-Petténi, G.—Colloqui e profili. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. 229 pp. L. 15.

Farinelli, A.—Marrano, storia di un vituperio. *Genève*: Leo S. Olschki, 1925. x + 78 pp. (Biblioteca dell' "Archivum romanicum." Serie II: linguistica; vol. 10.)

Fattorello, F.—Appunti sulla letteratura italiana del Friuli nel '400. *Rocca S. Casciano*: L. Cappelli, 1925. 4 pp. (Rivista letteraria delle tre Venezie.)

Fiacchi, L. (Clasio).—Favole scelte, pubblicate in occasione del primo centenario della morte. *Firenze*: G. Giannini e figlio, 1925. 76 pp. L. 1.35. (Collezione cartolina romanzo, no. 16.)

Flori, E.—Il teatro di Ugo Foscolo con un'appendice sul pensiero filosofico foscoliano. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. 183 pp. L. 25.

Francesco, San.—Il cantico di Frate Sole composto in S. Damiano d'Assisi (1225-1925). *Todi*: Tip. Tuderte, 1925. 61 pp. L. 3.

Galilei, Galileo.—Due lezioni all' Accademia fiorentina circa la figura, sito e grandezza dell'Inferno di Dante, a cura di L. Negri. Testo, introduzione, note, tavola illustrativa. *Torino*: Casa edit. G. Chiantore, 1925. xvi + 36 pp. L. 3.50. (Collezione di classici italiani con note.)

Imbert, G.—Francesco Redi. L'uomo, dal carteggio edito ed inedito e da' ricordi. La villa medicea di Pratolino secondo i viaggiatori francesi e i poeti. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1925. viii + 138 pp. L. 6.

Lingueglia, P.—In non valore dell'irreligiosità carducciana. Saggio apologetico. *Faenza*: Edit. "Salesiana," 1925. vi + 177 pp. L. 8.

Lombardo Pellegrino, E.—Dante e la concezione politica. Conferenza. *Messina*: S. Longo, 1925. 77 pp. L. 5.

Luigini da Udine, F.—Il libro della bella donna. *Milano*: "L'Aristocratica," 1925. 128 pp. L. 12. (Collana di testi e documenti per servire alla storia dei costumi. I classici dell'amore, no. 24.)

Monti, G. M.—Le villanelle alla napoletana e l'antica lirica dialettale a Napoli. *Città di Castello*: Casa ed. "Il Solco," 1925. xii + 371 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca di cultura letteraria, vol. 4.)

Panzacchi, Enrico.—Poesie. Visioni e immagini, dolores, intima vita, brevi poemi, spiriti magni, fantasie, funebria, racconti, alma natura, piccolo romanziere, varie, le istorie, l'intermezzo, terra immitte, ultime rime, rime inedite o rare, con prefazione di Giovanni Pascoli. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. xxxi + 587 pp.

Passavanti, Jacopo.—Lo specchio di vera penitenza. Introduzione e testo a cura di Maria Lenardon, e con prefazione di D. Giuliotti. *Firenze*: Libr. ed. Fiorentina, 1925. xl + 424 pp. L. 10. (I libri della fede, XVII.)

Pellico, Silvio.—Le mie prigionie, con introduzione e note di V. Piccoli. *Milano*: Caddeo, 1924. xvi + 208 pp. L. 4.40. (Collezione universale, nos. 106-107.)

Pellizzari, A.—Classicismo e romanticismo nella letteratura italiana dell'Ottocento. Due lezioni tratte dagli appunti di un ascoltatore. *Genova*: Federazione magistrale ligure N. T., 1925. 16 pp. (Corso di preparazione ai concorsi magistrali e di direttore didattico.)

Piccioni, L.—Fra poeti e giornalisti. Note di storia e di critica letteraria. *Livorno*: R. Giusti, 1925. 206 pp. L. 10.

Queirolo, A.—Giacomo Leopardi. *Genova*: Federazione magistrale ligure N. T., 1925. 31 pp. (Corso di preparazione ai concorsi magistrali e di direttore didattico. Lezioni di letteratura italiana, dagli appunti d'un ascoltatore.)

Rigon, Ermenegilda.—Letteratura per l'infanzia e la giovinezza. *Genova*: Federazione magistrale ligure N. T., 1925. 85 pp. (Corso di preparazione ai concorsi magistrali e di direttore didattico.)

Sermini, Gentile.—Novelle grasse. *Milano*: "L'Aristocratica," 1925. 229 pp. L. 16. (Collana di testi e documenti per servire alla storia dei costumi. I classici dell'amore, no. 22.)

Sternberg, F.—Dante nel pensiero di Giovanni Pascoli. I: La personalità di Dante. *Trieste*: Libr. Treves-Zanichelli, 1925. 38 pp. L. 3.

Testoni, A.—Ricordi di teatro. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. 261 pp. L. 15.

Torraca, F.—Aneddoti di storia letteraria napoletana. *Città di Castello*: "Il Solco," casa ed., 1925. 391 pp. L. 16. (Biblioteca di cultura letteraria, no. 3.)

Ulargiu, V.—Fonologia sarda logudorese e campidanese. Brevi note illustrative. *Palermo*: R. Sandron, 1925. 27 pp. L. 1.80.

Vignoli, C.—Il vernacolo di Veroli in provincia di Roma. *Roma: Soc. Filologica Romana*, 1925. 70 pp. L. 20. (I dialetti di Roma e del Lazio: studi e documenti pubblicati in memoria di Ernesto Monaci sotto il patrocinio del comune di Roma. Società Filologica Romana, III.)

Volpe, A. C.—Il preludio del Paradiso, canto I. Discorso letto nella sala di Dante in Ravenna. *Ravenna: Arti grafiche*, 1925. 27 pp. L. 2.

Ximenes, E. E.—L'episodio della Francesca in una conferenza di Ettore Romagnoli nella Casa di Dante a Roma. *Milano: Casa edit. della "Lirica internazionale"*, 1925. 16 pp. L. 3. (Biblioteca di studi danteschi.)

## SPANISH

Alvarez Quintero, S. y J.—La flor de la vida. Ed. by Reed and Brooks. *New York: Heath*, 1926. xviii + 106 pp. (Heath's Contemporary Spanish Texts.)

Argote de Molina, G.—Discurso sobre la poesía castellana. Ed. y notas de E. F. Tiscornia. *Madrid: Victoriano Suárez*, 1926. 125 pp. (Biblioteca española de divulgación científica, VI.)

Baroja, P.—El gran torbellino del mundo. *Madrid: Caro Raggio*, 1926. 359 pp. 5 ptas.

Blanco y Sánchez, R.—Nociones de lengua castellana o española. Gramática. Décima edición. *Madrid: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos"*, 1925. 80 pp.

Blasco Ibáñez, V.—El papa del mar. *Valencia: Prometeo*, 1926. 5 ptas.

Cervantes.—Rinconete y Cortadillo. Edited by J. T. Lister. *New York: Knopf*, 1926. x + 98 pp. (The Borzoi Spanish Texts.)

Chaytor, H. J.—Dramatic theory in Spain. Extracts from literature before and during the golden age. *Cambridge: University Press*, xvi + 63 pp.

Cruz, R. de la.—Ocho sainetes inéditos, ed. by C. E. Kany. *Berkeley: Univ. Press*, 1925. 210 pp. \$2. (U. of Cal. pubs. in mod. philology.)

Diego, G.—Versos humanos. *Madrid: Imp. de A. Sáenz*, 1925. 5 ptas. (Premio del Concurso Nacional de Literatura, 1924-1925.)

Fichter, W. L.—Lope de Vega's El Castigo del Discreto, together with a study of conjugal honor in his theatre. *New York: Instituto de las Españas*, 1925. 283 pp.

Forner, J. P.—Exequias de la lengua castellana. *Madrid: "La Lectura"*, 1925. (Clásicos castellanos, 66.)

Frisoni, G.—Grammatica spagnola. *Milano: Hoepli*, 1925. viii + 172 pp. L. 7.50.

Galiana, Fr. L. de.—Cartas eruditas. Las publica V. Castañeda y Alcover. *Madrid: Tip. "Revista de Archivos"*, 1926. 214 pp.

García Gutiérrez, A.—Venganza catalana. Juan Lorenzo. *Madrid: "La Lectura"*, 1926. (Clásicos castellanos, 65.)

Lázaro, A.—Jacinto Benavente. De su vida y de su obra. *Madrid: Agencia Mundial de Publicidad*, 1926.

Luisi, Luisa.—A través de libros y autores. *Buenos Aires: Ed. de Nuestra América*, 1925.

Maestu, R. de.—Don Quijote, don Juan y la Celestina. Ensayos en simpatía. *Madrid: Calpe*, 1925.

Navarro Tomás, T. and Espinosa, A. M.—A primer of Spanish pronunciation. *New York: Sanborn & Co.*, 1926. xv + 128 pp.

Nogales, J.—Las tres cosas del tío Juan. *Madrid: Fernando Fe*, 1926.

Ocantos, C. M.—La Ola. Novelas Argentinas. Tomo XVI. *Madrid: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos"*, 1925. 340 pp.

Ortiz, F.—Glosario de afronegrismos. Con un prólogo de J. M. Dihigo. *Habana: Imp. "El Siglo XX."* xxviii + 558 pp. Doll. 5.

Pérez de Ayala, R.—Tigre Juan. *Madrid: Pueyo*, 1926. 247 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras completas, vol. XVIII.)

—El curandero de su honra. *Madrid: Pueyo*, 1926. 270 pp. 5 ptas. (Obras completas, vol. XIX.)

Poema de Mio Cid.—Versión de Pedro Salinas. *Madrid: Revista de Occidente*, 1926. 185 pp. 5 ptas. (Musas lejanas, VIII.)

Romero de Terreros, M. and Millard Rosenberg, S. L.—México virreinal, Acuarelas de Nueva España. *New York: Knopf*, 1925. viii + 250 pp.

Silva Uzcategui, R. D.—Historia crítica del modernismo en la literatura castellana. *Venezuela: 1925.*

Vega, Lope de.—El Marqués de las Navas. Publicada por J. F. Montesinos. *Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos*, 1925. 214 pp. + 4 facsímiles. 8 ptas. (Teatro antiguo español. Textos y estudios. VI.)

Vergara, G. M.—Cuatro mil palabras no incluidas en el Diccionario de la R. A. E. (décima quinta edición). *Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadeneyra*, 1925. 194 pp.

Zarco Cuevas, J.—Catálogo de los manuscritos castellanos de la Real Biblioteca de El Escorial. *Madrid: Imp. Helénica*. cxxxii + 370 pp. 25 ptas.